



STRENGTHENING THE PROTECTED AREA NETWORK

(SPAN)

PIMS3121

FINAL EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by: Oliver Chapeyama

May 2012



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Lessons Learnt	8
Recommendations.....	10
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	11
1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation	11
1.2 Key issues addressed in the Evaluation	12
1.3 Methodology of the Evaluation.....	13
1.4 Structure of the Report.....	14
2.0 PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN	15
2.1 The Project and its Development Context	15
2.1.2 Project Start and Duration.....	15
Problems that the Project was introduced to address	16
2.1.3 Project Immediate and Development Objectives	16
2.1.4 Expected Outcomes/ Results.....	16
3.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	19
3.1 Project Formulation	19
3.2 Implementation Approach.....	20
3.3 Role of Implementing and Executing Agencies.....	20
3.3.1 Role of Government of Namibia.....	20
3.3.2 Role of UNDP Country Office.....	20
3.4 Cost Effectiveness.....	21
3.5 Country Ownership/Drivenness.....	22
3.6 Stakeholder Consultation	24

3.7	Linkages between the Project and other Interventions	24
3.8	Monitoring and Evaluation	26
3.9	Project Budget and Financial Planning	26
4.0	RESULTS TO DATE	29
4.1	Results at Objective Level	36
4.2	Results at Outcome Level	36
5.0	PROJECT IMPACTS, RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY BEYOND THE PROJECT LIFE CYCLE.....	40
5.1	Project Impact	40
5.2	Risk Analysis	40
5.3	Sustainability of Project Outcomes.....	42
5.3.1	Institutional Sustainability	42
5.3.2	Financial Sustainability.....	43
5.3.3	Social Sustainability.....	43
5.3.4	Environmental Sustainability	44
5.4	Potential for Replication of Project Outcomes.....	44
5.5	Information Dissemination and Communications	44
5.6	The Use of Technology.....	45
6.0	LESSONS LEARNT.....	45
7.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	48
8.0	ANNEXES	49

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BMM	Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili
CBD	Convention on Biodiversity
CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resources Management
CITES	International Convention on Trade in Endangered Species
CoP	Conference of the Parties
CPP-Nam	Community Partnership Programme
FENATA	Federation of Namibian Tourism Associations
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
EU-RPRP	European Union Rural Poverty Reduction Project
GTZ	German Development Agency
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICEMA	Integrated Community Based Ecosystem management Project
IDRNC	Integrated Rural Development and nature Conservation
KfW	German Development Bank
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NACOMA	Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project
NDP	National Development Plan
NAMDEB	Namibia Development Corporation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NTB	Namibia Tourism Board
NWR	Namibia wildlife Resorts
N\$	Namibian Dollar
PA	Protected Area
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PDF	Project Development Fund
PMU	Project Management Unit
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SANParks	South Africa National Parks
SGP	Special Grants Programme
SPAN	Strengthening Protected Area Network Project
TFCA	Transfrontier Conservation Area
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the findings of the Final Evaluation of the Namibia Strengthening Protected Area Network (SPAN) project. The evaluation was conducted between January and March of 2012 to monitor and assess the project's results and impacts as required by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Specifically, the evaluation was conducted to achieve the following objectives:

- To assess the project's overall performance against the project objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents;
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project;
- To critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the Project;
- To list and document lessons concerning Project design, implementation and management;
-
- To assess Project relevance to national priorities; and To provide guidance for the similar Project activities in other parts of the world.

The SPAN Project is a Nationally Executed project that is implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) with financial support from GEF. Total project budget was US\$ 8.5 million. The project has been under implementation from 2006 and is due to close in September 2012. Although the SPAN project was designed as a two phase project, it was only implemented as a single phase project due to changes in GEF programming Policy. The project was designed to focus on three broad areas of intervention, namely: 1) strengthening systemic capacity within the executing agencies for the creation of an enabling legal/policy environment and improved financial management systems for protected area (PA) management; 2) strengthening the institutional capacity for PA management; and 3) demonstrating new ways and means of PA management, including partnerships with other government agencies, local communities and the private sector, to promote the creation of a sustainable network of protected areas representing all six biomes found in Namibia. These interventions were considered to be critical to the improvement of management effectiveness in the PA system as a whole. The suites of activities under each component were designed to remove the barriers to improved management performance in the protected area system.

Throughout the project, strong emphasis was placed on the replication of best practices within Namibia and elsewhere through proactive knowledge management.

The project was designed to address the following problems that characterised the management of the PA system in Namibia:

- insufficient infrastructure in the parks;
- poor park management due to insufficient system funding and systemic undervaluation of protected areas;
- fragmented policy framework;
- weak institutional and human capacities for PA management,

- limited representation of bio-geographic regions in the PA system, and
- the absence of tested mechanisms for public-private-community partnerships in the management of the country's PA system..

The SPAN project was instituted to intervene so as to lift these barriers in order to improve management effectiveness in state PAs and on terrestrial ecosystems, as well as to complement other initiatives in ecosystem management across the country.

The problems highlighted above were to be addressed through interventions meant to achieve the following Objectives and Outcomes:

Project Objective: The immediate objective of the full project is: *increased management effectiveness of the national PA network for biodiversity conservation.*

Expected Outcomes/ Results

As per the project design, the following three complementary project outcomes were expected from project implementation:

Outcome 1: Improved systemic capacity provides the enabling framework for enhancing Protected Area management effectiveness.

Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for Protected Area management are strengthened, resulting in more effective use of financial and human resources.

Outcome 3: Protected Area management know-how is expanded and reinforced through innovative field management demonstration.

The project was implemented through a Project Management Group (PMG) which was chaired by the Permanent Secretary for the MET. The PMG was the highest policy making body under the project. A Project Advisory Committee established under the PMG provided technical guidance to the PMU that was headed by a Project Coordinator and a dedicated team of staff engaged to implement the project on a day-to-day basis.. The PMU was embedded within the Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management in the MET.

The Final Evaluation assessed the achievements of the project at Objective and Outcome levels. Progress towards the Project Objective was to be tracked through two indicators, the first measuring net improvement in management effectiveness for protected areas as set in the Namibia Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (NAMETT) and the second measuring the extent to which Namibia's PANetwork represented the six biomes that characterise the country's biodiversity.

Project interventions were tested at four selected field demonstration sites around the country, namely: /Ai-//Ais Hot Springs Game Park and Sperrgebiet National Park in the south, Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili (BMM) Complex in the north east and Etosha National Park-Skeleton Coast link in the north west of the country.

The Final Evaluation established that 98% of PA land was under improved management effectiveness, which far exceeded the end of project target of 50%. In addition, the project had addressed the recommendation of the Mid-Term Evaluation to identify a smaller PA to demonstrate management

effectiveness. Waterberg Plateau Park was chosen as recommended and the evaluation can testify to marked improvement in the management of the Park.

Progress towards the proclamation of Kunene People's Park in the Etosha National Park-Skeleton Coast demonstration site was slowed by the failure of the government and community groups in the region to agree on a suitable management arrangement. However, community groups in the area are sensitised on the need for protecting the area through community level interventions that have been implemented in the area through Namibia's CBNRM Programme over the last twenty years. Although this biome remains poorly represented in Namibia's PA network the evaluation established that the area is under effective management due to the levels of community awareness of the value of the resources in the area. The proclamation of Dorob National Park that links the Namib Naukluft and Skeleton Coast National Parks in October 2011 has effectively completed the plans to have the whole of Namibia's coastal area proclaimed a PA.

The Evaluation concluded that the project has **achieved its Objective** of increasing management effectiveness of the national PA network for biodiversity conservation.

The following results have been achieved under each of the project outcomes:

Outcome 1: Improved systemic capacity provides the enabling framework for enhancing Protected Area management effectiveness.

The main focus under this Outcome was the enactment of the Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill which has been under development for the past twelve years. At the time of the Final Evaluation, this Bill had been reviewed by the Attorney General's Office and comments have been submitted to MET. As stated at the Mid-Term Review stage, the Project has worked with government through MET to develop policies on diverse issues related to PA management including Human Wildlife Conflict, Tourism Concessioning and Parks and Neighbours which are proving to be useful instruments that the Project can claim responsibility for.

As was observed at Mid-Term Review, the framework for knowledge management that has been created through the Incident Book Monitoring System is very elaborate and is followed closely at Park level. Data collected at Park level through this system is also used for park planning purposes at national level while MET have included the system in their operational budget. A comprehensive information and publicity campaign on the project has been instituted with brochures and fact sheets on parks produced and widely disseminated. This has resulted in high visibility for the project. A Quarterly Park Newsletter (Sandpaper) has been published consistently and widely disseminated throughout the period of project implementation. To ensure that this process is sustainable, senior management at MET have committed to continue with the publication of Sandpaper, albeit at reduced frequency. This commitment is in recognition of the newsletter's focus on Park management activities which will compliment the MET's own internal newsletter Earthbound which covers broader environmental management issues.. The project also produced a State of the Parks Report that traced the progress made with PA management as well as the challenges faced in the process.

Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for PA management are strengthened, resulting in more effective use of financial and human resources.

MET budget procedures have been revised with Regional Offices designated as cost centres responsible for their own budgets. This has improved management efficiency, especially procurement procedures

which have seen the procurement cycle cut down to fourteen days from the original sixty days. The Ministry of Finance has also approved that MET be allowed to retain 25% of annual park entrance fees and make these available through the GPTF for the development of various infrastructure projects. Chief Control Wardens interviewed during the Final Evaluations confirmed that they now felt empowered as they can now make decisions much more quickly. This situation is set to improve with the implementation of the new MET structure which will see the establishment of the office of Deputy Director at regional level.

Human resources development plans have been developed with staff at various levels in MET while training opportunities identified at MET have been implemented. Up to thirty training opportunities involving more than three hundred staff have been offered with some support being offered through partner project such as the Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Project (SKEP) in the south of the country. In addition to training, a number of incentive schemes have been developed in order to motivate staff in their positions. The Performance Management System that was developed in collaboration with the Prime Minister's Office has been pilot tested at MET. However this system could not be fully implemented as it required approval from the Office of the Prime Minister to ensure that it was consistent with the national system and also that it could be implemented at Ministerial level. This should now happen soon since the MET has now been identified as one of the Ministries where the national performance Management system will be implemented.

All SPAN Demo Sites developed Park Management Plans which have been submitted to MET but are still to be approved. Training in business planning has also been offered and reference materials on the training produced for use by Park Managers going forward.

Outcome 3: PA management know-how is expanded and reinforced through innovative field management demonstration.

As observed at the time of the Mid-Term Evaluation the SPAN project had established demonstration sites at the Etosha National Park, /Ai-/Ais/Sperrgebiet, and the Bwabwata Mudumu Mamili (BMM) complex. Progress at the Etosha site was limited by the failure by government to agree to the participation of communities in Park management highlighted earlier. The efforts of the field coordinators at the /Ai-/Ais/Sperrgebiet demo site and at the BMM complex who were very innovative in the manner in which they promoted collaboration with other on-going initiatives in the two areas have resulted in some very effective results which have had impacts at community level. Public-Private-Community partnerships which benefit community groups directly were developed with support from earlier GEF funded initiatives such as the ICEMA, SKEP and project supported by KfW, the German Development Bank in the BMM Complex. As a result of these support initiatives community interest in the projects by participating communities was . An important observation made during the evaluation was that it is difficult to isolate the impact of SPAN at all demo sites as the project built upon work that was initiated by precursor initiatives.

Wildlife management is largely the preserve of males in most rural communities across East and Southern Africa. The participation of women has been encouraged through the making and selling of local crafts and artefacts, basketry etc. As observed during the Mid-Term review, income levels among the women have increased significantly as a result of their participation in these activities. Comprehensive gender disaggregated assessments need to be conducted to measure the full extent of project impacts on women as against those experienced by the broader society in the project area.

Financial management, annual audits and monitoring and evaluation were performed successfully through the life of the project. Further, in recognition of the need for sustainability of the project outputs and outcomes beyond the life of the project, a sustainability plan that details strategies for the continued implementation of critical aspects of the project such as the Knowledge Management aspects was produced by the PMU before project close out. It is important that MET focusses on ensuring that the recommendations from the Sustainability Plan are implemented without delay.

Due to the results at Objective and Outcome levels described above the project performance at End-of Project stage was rated as **Highly Successful (HS)**.

Lessons Learnt

In addition to the results discussed above, the project has also yielded lessons that are presented in this report for consideration in the design and implementation of projects and programmes targeting similar concerns that GEF might fund in other countries and regions worldwide.

1. Improving management effectiveness in PAs has many facets and there is need to ensure that all the aspects of management effectiveness are understood by all stakeholders at the beginning of projects aiming to address this issue.

Consultations with stakeholders involved in the implementation of SPAN revealed that some stakeholders had different expectations of the project from those held by executing agencies such as the PMU. Some senior government officials had expected that SPAN would support the development of Park infrastructure as most of the infrastructure in Parks was in need of rehabilitation at the time the project was introduced. Infrastructure development was therefore considered an important component of improvement of management effectiveness. SPAN was however focussed on the “soft” aspects of management effectiveness such as capacity building and did not support infrastructure development resulting in these stakeholders adjudging the project to have been less successful than it is generally perceived to have been. It is however important to note that additional funding for the rehabilitation of parks has been leveraged from other sources such as kfW and the Millennium Change Compact.

2. There is need to rationalise project goals with those of successor projects to ensure that transition from one project to another is smooth.

The SPAN project was implemented against a background of numerous projects that targeted developments within Namibia’s protected areas and in the areas surrounding these areas. Examples of such projects include Namibia Coast Conservation and Management (NACOMA) project, Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management (ICEMA) and the Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (CPP NAM ISLM). Projects such as Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Area Initiative (NAM-PLACE) and the recently GEF approved project that will focus on financing National Parks have also since been mobilised and or agreed to but there does not seem to be any direct linkage between these projects and SPAN despite the fact that they are focussed on the same area that SPAN was. As the lessons and experiences from the implementation of the SPAN project are collated they need to be appropriately packaged and used to inform this follow-on work.

3. There is need to ensure that all projects are mainstreamed into the national government initiatives as projects should not be considered as alternatives to government programmes.

Mainstreaming of development projects into national development planning processes helps assure sustainability of the outcomes of these projects. The evaluation found little evidence of SPAN having worked with local government and the National Planning Commission where national development planning is coordinated. The period between the evaluation and the official project close out should therefore be used to synthesise results that can be used to inform these planning processes. Adequate budgetary provisions should be made at MET to ensure the integration of the outcomes of the SPAN project into overall national planning processes.

4. Projects that deal with biodiversity management and access to land and other resources cut across various sectors which all need to be involved in their implementation for effective institutionalisation of project outputs and outcomes into the national development planning processes..

The Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management will need to assume the role of champion in order that the outputs of SPAN can be used to influence development planning in Namibia. Overtures will need to be made to institutions such as the National Planning Commission, the Ministries of Local Government and Lands as well as civil society organisations to ensure that they are involved in the planning and implementation of programmes that guarantee the sustainable management of Namibia's protected area system.

5. Projects that engage nationals and residents of recipient countries as managers contribute to the building of capacity for project management in country.

Namibia has received large amounts of project-based development assistance from GEF through which a wide variety of project management skills have been developed. These skills include project management, financial management and logistics management among others. In addition, the recruitment of young female Namibian Project Assistants/Interns at SPAN has helped address the issues of gender and sustainability under this project. Some of the Project Managers that have worked on the project have gone on to join international development organisations and to manage follow-on projects, while the interns who have worked on the project have acquired skills that they will be able to use later on in their professional lives. The Government of Namibia needs to ensure that at the end of each project all relevant staff involved in these initiatives are retained either through integration into national government entities or through engagement in follow on projects to avoid loss of skilled personnel. There is need for the development of a deliberate strategy that ensures that nationals with project management skills are retained in the country. .

6. Complex projects which include capacity building and changing the way governments and local level stakeholders do business require long implementation time frames to allow for the institutionalisation of their outputs. Government processes are generally slow. A good example is that of the process of developing the Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill which has taken the better part of 12 years and all six years of the implementation of the SPAN project..

The SPAN project was originally designed as a two-phase project but ended up being implemented as a single phase project after changes to the GEF planning procedures. The original two phases would have allowed enough time for the realisation of intended project outputs. There is therefore need to ensure that such projects are appropriately designed with adequate implementation timeframes being provided for to facilitate the realisation of desired project results.

Recommendations

Final Evaluations are not meant to make recommendations for follow-on actions. However, where specific issues of importance are identified, specific recommendations can be made to assist with improving the way projects and programmes are designed and managed.

Namibia continues to attract support from GEF and other donors in support of biodiversity management and sustainable land management programmes. It is therefore easy for the country to continue with the implementation of such programmes on the strength of expected continued resource flows and not stop to assess where these programmes are headed.

It is recommended that UNDP step back and conduct a programme/project audit across the biodiversity, water, capacity building and sustainable land management spectrum to distill lessons and experiences from all initiatives for use in the design of new programme interventions.

The evaluator understands that METT is a global management tool developed for use in tracking the effectiveness of PA management initiatives and that Namibia has already amended some aspects of this tool to come up with NAMETT which addresses Namibian conditions specifically. However, the evaluator observed that this tool is mechanistic as it uses numeric measures for assessing project outputs which are not appropriate for measuring aspects such as ecosystem health which are important for assessing the effectiveness of PA management.

It is recommended that UNDP and GEF assess the utility of the METT given the experience with its use in projects to date. This should be done with a view to developing an assessment tool that adequately addresses more than just process indicators of PA management. METT should also assess progress with issues such as ecosystems health which are important for assessing management effectiveness at park level.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Strengthening Protected Area Network (SPAN) project was implemented as a Nationally Executed project through the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) with financial support from UNDP GEF. The total project budget was US\$ 8.5 million. The project was designed in 2004/5 for implementation over a six year period between 2006 and 2012 with a provision for a second phase thereafter. In designing the project, the (MET) was taking advantage of funding opportunities from the GEF to spearhead the long-overdue upgrading of Namibia's PA system. Senior management at the MET and executives of Non-governmental Organisations registered in Namibia took a direct interest in the conceptualisation of the project.

The SPAN project was focused on three broad areas of intervention: 1) strengthening systemic capacity, namely the enabling legal/policy environment and financial mechanisms for protected area (PA) management; 2) strengthening the institutional capacity for PA management; and 3) demonstrating new ways and approaches to PA management, including partnerships with other government agencies, local communities and the private sector, to promote the creation of a sustainable network of protected areas. These interventions were considered to be critical in the improvement of management effectiveness in the PA system as a whole with activities under each component targetting the removal of barriers against the management performance of the protected area system.

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives.

These are to:

- a) Monitor and evaluate project results and impacts;
- b) Provide a basis for decision making on necessary project amendments and improvements;
- c) Promote accountability for resource use; and
- d) Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

The Final Evaluation of the SPAN project was conducted to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of project outcomes against set objectives as well as to assess the extent to which administrative processes under the project were managed.

The evaluation was also meant to distill lessons for use in the design of projects with similar focus in other parts of the world.

The purpose of the Final Evaluation is detailed in the Terms of Reference as follows:

- to assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents;
- to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project;
- to critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the Project and whether this had any effect on the operations of the project and therefore achievement of its results;

- to list and document initial lessons concerning Project design, implementation and management;
- to assess Project outcomes and implementation constraints;
- to assess Project relevance to national priorities;
- to provide guidance for future Projects of similar nature.

The evaluation was also conducted to compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and to assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. Project performance was also to be measured on the basis of the quantitative and qualitative indicators as defined in the Logical Framework and the Results Framework detailed in the Project Document.

1.2 Key issues addressed in the Evaluation

The evaluation of the SPAN project was conducted to address the following key issues:

(1) Project Design – A review of the original project intervention strategy including objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities was conducted to assess the quality of the design and the delivery of planned outcomes. The review of the project design focused on the project conceptualization, effectiveness, relevance as well as the project’s potential for implementation. A review of the project Logical Framework matrix, as amended, was also conducted as part of this process.

(2) Project Progress and Impact – An assessment of the project achievements was conducted against the original objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities as stated in the Logframe and amendments made at Mid-Term Review. An assessment of the indicators of progress was also conducted to test the objectivity of these indicators.

(3) Project Implementation – The evaluator reviewed the processes that were used in the implementation of the project with specific focus on the following aspects as detailed in the Terms of Reference:

- a. Project management arrangements: A review of the effectiveness of the UNDP Regional Office, the UNDP Country Office, the SPAN Project Management Unit (PMU), and the demonstration sites;
- b. An assessment of the quality and timeliness of delivering on project outputs and activities; This assessment included a review of the extent to which project management had worked with Government of Namibia counterparts, other UNDP-GEF funded projects as well as with development agencies that were funding projects in the sector. The following are some of the partners that were reviewed: GEF-supported projects (ICEMA, NACOMA, CPP-NAM, SGP, NAMPLACE), UNDP, Government counterparts (Ministry of Environment and Tourism; Mines and Energy; Fisheries and Marine Resources), bilateral-funded projects (USAID, KfW, Conservation International, Millennium Challenge Account, GTZ, SKEP); PMU; demonstration sites (Etosha-Skeleton Coast, //Ai-Ais, Bwabwata-Madumu-Mamili. Sperrgebiet) and private companies (NAMDEB, NWR, NTB) as well as those listed in the Project Document in the stakeholder participation plan as project co-financiers;;
- c. A review of the financial management systems including the project budget and the project expenditure status. This review included an assessment of the audit reports conducted from 2006 to 2011.; and
- d. The extent to which the Project Implementation team applied adaptive management in response to partner and stakeholder feedback;.

The evaluation was also conducted to assess the extent to which the project made progress towards achieving its objectives and where gaps were evident. Lessons from project implementation were also to be distilled and recommendations made on how to improve future programming under GEF funding.

1.3 Methodology of the Evaluation

The evaluation process involved:

- the review of project related documents;
- interviews with policy makers and project managers at various levels;
- field visits, and interviews with stakeholders including selected project beneficiaries.

The evaluation consultant reviewed the overarching documents that define the context within which the project was implemented. These included national legislation and policies relating to development planning, wildlife conservation and environmental protection. At the project level, the consultant reviewed the project document, project implementation progress reports, financial management and audit reports, and back-to-mission reports by UNDP project staff which provided information on project implementation progress.

A second aspect of the approach to the evaluation was contact with project stakeholders in the project demonstration sites as well as with national level entities that were involved with project implementation in Windhoek. The evaluator specifically targeted policy makers in MET, the DPWM and the Energy and Environment Unit of UNDP. The evaluator also consulted representatives of various non-governmental organizations and private sector entities that the SPAN project collaborated with in the implementation of the project activities.

At the project level, the evaluator had briefing sessions and constant interaction with the Project Management Unit staff in Windhoek in order to obtain a clear sense of issues related to the implementation of the project. Field visits were conducted to field demonstration sites in the North East and in the south of the country where site meetings and targeted interviews were conducted with MET staff, lodge operators and some community representatives to establish the level of impact the project has had on the ground. Unfortunately, the majority of project implementation staff on the ground had already left the project by the time of the final evaluation and could therefore not be contacted for their input.

The evaluation was based on the UNDP/GEF guidelines for project evaluations which require a review and assessment of the following elements:

- a) Project Conceptualization/Design;
- b) Project Relevance;
- c) Project Implementation;
- d) Project Performance; and
- e) Results/Success of the project applied to each of the project outcomes and outputs.

In addition, the following project elements were also assessed:

- a) Country ownership/Driveness;
- b) Stakeholder participation/ Public Involvement;
- c) Sustainability;
- d) Replication approach;
- e) Risk Management
- e) Financial planning;
- f) Cost-effectiveness; and
- g) Monitoring and evaluation.

1.4 Structure of the Report

A brief Executive Summary covering major findings of the evaluation is given at the beginning of this report. This is followed by Section 1 which provides background and context to the project and describes the objectives of the Terminal Evaluation.

Section 2 provides an assessment of the project concept and design, objectives and activities. This also includes a discussion of any design changes that were implemented since the mid-term evaluation and how these have assisted with the realization of project objectives.

Section 3 discusses the findings of the evaluation with respect to the following aspects: project formulation, implementation approach and its cost effectiveness, the extent to which the project was driven by national priorities, stakeholder participation in the design and implementation of the project, financial planning and management and linkages with other projects. An assessment of the contributions of the various project management entities to project implementation is also provided under this section.

Section 4 analyses the project's results and outcomes. This analysis forms the basis upon which the overall project performance is assessed. This assessment is conducted at project objective and component level to measure the results or outputs the project has produced when measured against the targets and indicators set at project initiation. The project impacts and potential for sustainability of its results beyond the project life are analyzed in Section 5 which is followed by an assessment of Lessons Learnt in Section 6 and Conclusions and Recommendations in Section 7.

Section 8 shows the reference material used in compiling this report.

Finally a list of Annexes is attached. These include the Project Logframe as amended, Revised Indicators and Targets, Terms of Reference, List of people interviewed and an Itinerary for the evaluation.

2.0 PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN

2.1 The Project and its Development Context

The development context of the SPAN project was clearly articulated in the Project Document and assessed in the Mid-Term Evaluation Report. Namibia's dryland ecosystems are recognised as a globally significant repository of biodiversity and are acclaimed for their species richness, habitat diversity and biological distinctiveness. In response to this, the country has institutionalised an effective system for the management of this biodiversity through establishing three broad categories of ecosystems management namely State PAs, Communal Conservancies and Private Reserves.

State Protected Areas are the cornerstone of long term conservation of biodiversity in Namibia. There are more than twenty PAs in the country covering 17% of Namibia's terrestrial area (114,000 km²) where most of the country's biomes are represented.

Communal conservancies form the second category of conservation and resource management in Namibia where community groups enjoy rights over wildlife and other resources for their own development. There are seventy one (71) communal conservancies covering more than 132 700 km² with additional sites due for registration in the near future.

In addition, 24 conservancies have been established on private lands, comprising around 1,000 commercial farms although these do not enjoy the same level of government recognition as communal conservancies. Despite this, up to 20% of Namibia's private land is estimated to be dedicated to wildlife management.

Communal conservancies and most private reserves cater simultaneously to conservation and production uses of land, such as livestock husbandry and farming. They act as buffers to the State PA system, providing a transition zone from more intensive to less intensive land uses across production landscapes, providing spillover areas for maintenance of wildlife populations as well as areas where wildlife movements are not hindered by fences. Taken together, the combination of State PAs and conservancies and private reserves offers some of the best prospects for protecting biodiversity in Namibia. However, because all these areas currently operate as a patchwork rather than as an integrated system, their conservation potential is undermined. There is huge potential for these areas to be woven together to form a tight, cohesive and effective network of PAs, providing an effective buffer against threats to biodiversity. However, a number of barriers are hindering movement toward improving PA management effectiveness. These are discussed in Section 2.1.2 below.

2.1.2 Project Start and Duration

The SPAN project was conceived as a two phased initiative with a planned start date of 2006. The first phase which is the subject of this Terminal Evaluation has been under implementation from 2007 to 2012. Due to changes in GEF programming policies which effectively ended the development of phased projects the second phase which was planned at the beginning was cancelled in 2007 and the project has been under implementation as a single phase initiative since then.

As per GEF guidelines the project was subjected to a Mid-term evaluation in 2009.

Problems that the Project was introduced to address

As stated in the Project Document, PA management systems in Namibia were generally weak, infrastructure was in a generally poor state while management systems were poorly developed due to a systemic undervaluation of PAs resulting in insufficient system financing. In addition, the following barriers also hindered the sustainable management of Parks: a fragmented policy framework; weak institutional capacities; weak human capacities for PA operations; incomplete bio-geographic coverage; and the absence of tested mechanisms for public-private-community partnerships.

The SPAN project was instituted to intervene and lift these barriers in order to improve management effectiveness in these state PAs.

2.1.3 Project Immediate and Development Objectives

Project Goal: The longterm development goal of the full GEF project was stated in the Project Document as: *Sustainable management of renewable natural resources protects biodiversity while contributing to equitable economic and social development.*

Project Objective: The immediate objective of the project is: *Increased management effectiveness of the national PA network for biodiversity conservation.*

2.1.4 Expected Outcomes/ Results

The project design identified three complementary project outcomes under which a number of outputs and activities were to be implemented. These are discussed below.

Outcome 1: Improved systemic capacity provides the enabling framework for enhancing PA management effectiveness.

Under this Outcome, the SPAN project set out to improve the broader environment or system that the project was to be implemented in. This included the enhancement of the legal and policy environment for PA management, the improvement of the financial mechanisms for park management and the formulation of park management plans.

The original focus of the project under this Outcome was the development and enactment of the Parks and Wildlife Management Act and associated Regulations. The enactment of the Act was expected to create the enabling framework for the realization of the following results: a) creation of new categories of protected area; b) development of a standardized approach towards protected area management and development planning; c) the institutionalisation of a monitoring regime for protected areas; d) the development of a framework for the management of concessions, covering tourism, hunting and other activities identified to be compatible with the Government's conservation objectives; e) establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism for protected area management; f) the institutionalization of adequate safeguards to prevent adverse impacts from minerals prospecting and mining on biodiversity; g) the development of cooperative and harmonized management arrangements between state protected areas and adjacent communal and private land.

Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for PA management are strengthened, resulting in more effective use of financial and human resources.

This component of the project was targeted at enhancing the capacities of the Parks department and the staff for park management and financial and human resources management. Capacity development support was also to be provided to other key role players in the sector including new creations such as the Namibia Wildlife Resorts, regional and local governments as well as traditional authorities.

An important area of focus for the project was the structural reorganization of the MET which was aimed at improving operational and administrative efficiencies, and maximizing cohesion among the MET divisions. Special emphasis was to be placed at the PA site level from where lessons were to be distilled for use in other PAs in Namibia and elsewhere where GEF provided funding for similar initiatives. The MET reorganization process was meant to test the efficacy of devolution of the decision making processes and financial management to the park level as a way of increasing the accountability of protected area managers. Devolution was to be tested at four demonstration sites around the country.

Reorganisation was to be accompanied by institutional capacity enhancement through management training which was to be conducted at the demonstration site level. In addition, a range of monetary and non-monetary incentive mechanisms such as performance awards were to be introduced as a way to motivate staff to perform at higher levels. An important issue regarding improved management of PAs that the project considered was that of sustainability through effective succession planning in management. Namibia is one of the many countries in Southern Africa that have been hard hit by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The project design incorporated an HIV/AIDS mitigation programme as a way of effecting a succession plan in the Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management.

The Valuation of Parks Study of 2004 and its update of 2008 demonstrated the value of Namibia's Parks estate resulting in increased government attention to this sector as indicated by the increase in funding of park management programmes. The SPAN project targeted this new interest and was set up to support improved management efficiency of the Parks through the introduction of business planning, capacity enhancement training and capacity to negotiate and manage concessions within protected areas for MET staff.

Finally, under this Outcome an effective Monitoring and Evaluation plan was to be introduced to track developments in effective management at protected area level. Feedback mechanisms were to be developed under this activity to inform project management at the pilot sites and nationally. Lessons learnt would be disseminated to inform the design of regional and global initiatives.

Outcome 3: PA management know-how is expanded and reinforced through innovative field management demonstration.

The project was initiated to address capacity enhancement for effective management of Namibia's Parks. Targeted interventions were made at four selected field demonstration sites to test the project objectives as stated under Outcomes 1 and 2 above. The chosen field demonstration sites were:

Field Demonstration Site 1: Ais Hot Springs Game Park:

At this site, the GEF funding was to support the following activities:

1) strengthening of the institutional framework for transfrontier park management Under this activity the MET financed staffing costs and routine operations expenses, while the GEF funded capacity building, including training and institutionalisation of administrative systems; 2) development of administrative systems and capacities to allow the devolution of decision making authorities and financial management functions from MET headquarters to the Protected area, 3) on-the-job training for joint law-enforcement and threat monitoring operations with South African National Parks (SANPARKS) (GEF support will be limited to the MET); 4) establishment of a monitoring system, to cover biological and socio-economic parameters, threats and management effectiveness; and 5) limited infrastructure construction including a visitor platform at the Fish River Canyon Viewing Point, staff accommodation and an interpretation centre.

Field Demonstration Site 2: Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili (BMM) Complex:

This site also known as the North East Parks Complex, has benefitted from project based long term interventions through the CBNRM initiatives that have been active in Namibia since independence. In addition KfW, the German development bank, is supporting a major infrastructure development initiative in the area. GEF funding was therefore planned to be complimentary to these efforts and to provide co-financing for the following intervention areas:

- 1) establishment of a local level consultative forum for integrated PA-conservancy management including a joint biodiversity-monitoring mechanism;
- 2) establishment of collaborative management systems including partner identification, clarification of rights and accountabilities, and capacity building for the MET and its partners;
- 3) establishment of benefit sharing mechanism for PA residents and neighbours; and
- 4) testing of the shared management responsibilities for shared resources.

Field Demonstration Site 3: Etosha National Park / Skeleton Coast Link

The Etosha National Park-Skeleton Coast Link field demonstration site provided a unique opportunity for demonstrating the utility of creating protected area networks including state, private and communal area conservation initiatives. The GEF funding was to target efforts to link the Etosha and Skeleton Coast protected areas and the concessions and community managed areas in Kunene Region. The intervention was also intended to build appropriate capacity to manage the expanded PA by focusing on:

- 1) development of business and management plans for the expanded PAs;

- 2) development of human-wildlife conflict mitigation measures, with USAID co-financing;
- 3) staff training, and development of capacities within conservancies for collaborative management within the protected areas (including definition of the roles and functions of the different partners, development of enforcement mechanisms, joint management systems, and capacity enhancement of community game rangers); and
- 4) provision of equipment (vehicles, communications infrastructure), development of limited infrastructure, including staff housing, and an interpretive centre to be co-managed by local communities.

Field Demonstration Site 4: Sperrgebiet National Park:

At the Sperrgebiet National Park site the project was aimed at supporting the establishment of a multi-sectoral Park Advisory Committee, staff training, the development of participatory management skills and provision of equipment including vehicles and radios. This support was to augment programme elements that were already being supported by MET and a number of international and local non-governmental organisations. The MET financed PA staffing, infrastructure development and Park operations. Conservation International supported the production of a biodiversity inventory and monitoring system. The NGO was already working in the //Ai //Ais National Park before its formal involvement in this initiative and also financed the purchase of land to facilitate the creation of the /Ais/Ais Sperrgebiet Transfrontier Park to protect conservation hotspots threatened with habitat conversions and the development of a business/tourism plan and accompanying regulations. .

3.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Project Formulation

The SPAN project was initially designed in two phases with Phase 1 focusing on improving management effectiveness of the existing PA network, through capacity building at the systemic, institutional and individual levels and testing various management and conservation approaches at four field demonstration sites. Phase 2 was intended to build on the expected successes of Phase 1 with a specific focus on mainstreaming PAs into regional and local development planning, developing new PAs categories on private lands and promoting the institutionalization of the concept of co-management.

The project purpose was to promote the long term conservation of species and genetic biodiversity in the areas inside and outside PAs in Namibia through the establishment of a network including state protected areas, communal area and private freehold conservation areas. SPAN was viewed as a framework intervention for all MET projects through which the barriers to effective management would be lifted in order to improve management effectiveness in the PA system as a whole. The project was designed with a specific focus on State PAs and on terrestrial ecosystems while complementing other initiatives in production landscapes and in coastal and marine ecosystems. GEF funding was identified as an initial opportunity to support this framework intervention which would be further supported through leveraging funds from other associated programmes.

At the global level, the SPAN project falls under the GEF Operational Programme 1 (Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems) and responds to GEF Strategic Priority 1 in the Biodiversity Focal Area (Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas). The Project was designed to address the following four types of operational activities suggested under this priority: 1) Demonstration and implementation of innovative financial mechanisms; b) Capacity building for long-term sustainability; c) Catalyzing community-public-private partnerships; and d) Removing barriers to the facilitation of public-private partnerships.

At the regional level, the project links with and benefits from the Southern Africa Regional Biodiversity Programme, a GEF funded initiative aimed at strengthening the capacity of SADC member states to implement provisions of the CBD. As a result of implementing this project, Namibia was expected to provide useful lessons to other SADC countries and the global community on the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources in PAs.

It is clear therefore that the SPAN project was designed to meet local, national, regional and global conservation and development objectives.

3.2 Implementation Approach

The SPAN project was a Nationally Executed Project implemented through the Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management of MET. Day-to-day management and implementation responsibility rested with the Project Management Unit which was embedded within the Executing Agency. An innovation that the project introduced was the secondment of Technical Officers to each pilot site to facilitate the implementation of the project. Overall project oversight was provided through a PMG and a Project Advisory Committee (PAC). Additional management committees were established at the project demonstration sites to monitor implementation. This management arrangement proved to be effective in delivering on project objectives and outcomes while building institutional capacities for project management.

The linkages that the project developed with other on-going initiatives in the sector in Namibia proved invaluable for advancing the goals and objectives of SPAN. These linkages also resulted in the leveraging of additional resources for the project. The assessment of co-financing that was realized in the Budget and Financial Planning Section of this report clearly demonstrates this aspect of project management.

3.3 Role of Implementing and Executing Agencies

3.3.1 Role of Government of Namibia

The Government of Namibia through the MET was the project beneficiary and therefore served as the Project Executing Agency. The Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management hosted the PMU and chaired the meetings of the PMG.

3.3.2 Role of UNDP Country Office

UNDP Namibia Country Office provided project management and guidance support to SPAN throughout the project's lifespan. To ensure that project management capacity was built within recipient government entities, UNDP promoted project management by Namibian nationals. This approach has resulted in strengthened project management capacities especially in the MET.

In addition to SPAN, UNDP Namibia has also provided similar support through a plethora of other initiatives making the Country Office one of the largest environment and development partners to the Government of Namibia. This evaluation report recommends that the outputs of this support be assessed to establish the extent to which the country has benefitted from the assistance it has received and to distill lessons for future engagement.

3.4 Cost Effectiveness

Project cost-effectiveness addresses concerns as to whether the resources made available for project implementation have been put to the best use possible. The social and political environment within which projects are implemented has a lot of influence on how effectively projects are implemented. Namibia has some specific socio-political realities that can influence both the pace at which projects are implemented and the effectiveness of resource use. With their direct relationship and linkage to the land issue in Namibia, wildlife management and PA management constitute a potentially contentious area of activity. Indeed, there have been cases where official positions have not facilitated the realization of some of the project's objectives. The failure by the project to realize the passing of the Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill in the allotted project timeframe is one such example. Further, government administrative systems promote the entrenchment of "institutional turf" at the same time as they turn over very slowly and can therefore adversely affect project implementation processes. The project's targets of systemic and institutional strengthening depended to a large extent on the pace at which government implemented internal programmes like institutional restructuring and decentralization of management responsibilities.

Despite the potential bottlenecks that are highlighted above, the SPAN project has made commendable progress towards realizing its objectives. The investment that the project made in the study on the economic value and financing of protected areas in 2004 and updated in 2008 which indicated that the PA system contributed upwards of six percent (6%) of the country's Gross Domestic Product has resulted in increased investments into the sector by government with annual budgetary allocations to park management having been increased by 310% in the last four years. In addition, through the influence of the SPAN project government has also authorized the earmarking of twenty-five percent (25%) of collected park entrance fees for reinvestment in park and wildlife management through the Game Products Trust Fund (GPTF). This is equivalent to an additional allocation of US\$ 2 million per year for park management.

It is customary for projects the size of SPAN to establish themselves as independent entities and work in total isolation from other on-going initiatives. Besides failing to benefit from experiences that have already been gained, projects implemented in this manner contribute to waste of resources as they invariably try to re-invent the wheel. It has been stated that SPAN was designed as a framework umbrella project for the implementation of the multiplicity of environmental projects that were operational in Namibia. In line with this, SPAN Project Management adopted an approach that was based on collaboration with already on-going initiatives thereby maximizing the benefits that were realized from joint implementation of programmes. The resources that SPAN has expended to date have thus been targeted at specific deliverables thereby enhancing cost effectiveness. Examples of this abound in all the areas where the project has been active-collaboration with KfW and IRDNC funded programmes in BMM

Complex, collaboration with Conservation International, SKEP and NNF and NACOMA in the /Ai-/Ais-Richtersveldt Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) and Spengerbeite National Park.

The SPAN project has also supported the institutionalization and implementation of a Concession Policy which has revamped the process of awarding of hunting and tourism concessions resulting in a diversified customer base and substantially increased revenues. Revenues realized from these revamped concessioning processes are in the region of N\$ 15 million as opposed to the N\$ 1.5 million that was being realized when the SPAN project was introduced. Fifteen concessions were awarded in 2009 alone while tourism development plans have been developed for the the new Sperrgebiet National Park, the proposed Kunene Peoples Park and the Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili Complex. Plans for Kunene People's Park have unfortunately not been implemented as the communities in the area and government have failed to agree on the interpretation of the concept of co-management. A potential threat against this concessioning process is the parallel process by the Government Tender Board targeting the award of concessions and Ministry of Energy and Mines prospecting rights. MET, through SPAN has been working to ensure that this potential conflict is resolved to avoid confusion.

Cost effectiveness is also influenced by the extent to which a project incorporates adaptive management strategies in its operations. Park management and operations systems depend on the extent to which staff skills are enhanced and decision-making responsibilities are devolved to the operational level. MET has made a commitment to decentralize park management and financial management to park level. The pace at which these processes will roll out is however dependent upon the pace at which government systems work. The Human Resource Transformation Advisor and a Financial Transformation Advisor engaged with MET management to develop human resources and financial management systems that are intended to lay the groundwork for effective implementation of the decentralization process. These systems were developed along the lines of the prototypes that have been developed by government so that they can easily be grafted onto the national programmes at the appropriate time. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, training programmes and incentive schemes for staff at various levels had been implemented with the result that staff in the outlying areas were now more motivated as a result of them feeling better appreciated by management.

An especially important contribution that the SPAN project has made to the protected area management programme in Namibia is the introduction of an HIV-AIDS mitigation strategy aimed at addressing the threat to sustainability of park management posed by increased mortality due to the pandemic. The strategy is important as it will address issues of family- friendly staff deployment especially in a Directorate such as Wildlife Management whose operations are mostly rural based. The location of most of the Ministry staff in the outlying areas also means that they have limited access to HIV/AIDS related information which this strategy will also address. In addition, the Project supported the development of the MET HIV-AIDS Policy.

All the initiatives discussed above that the SPAN project invested in despite a less than optimal operational environment point to the cost effectiveness of the project. The results that have been achieved lay a very strong foundation for promoting effective PA management in Namibia.

3.5 Country Ownership/Drivenness

The importance that the Government of Namibia places on biodiversity conservation and broader natural resource management is indicated in the country's constitution and national development initiatives such as Vision 2030 and National Development Plans. The third National Development Plan (NDP III) lays out clear objectives for the environment and natural resources management sector.

Namibia ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1997. The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) developed under the provisions of this Convention places a high priority on strengthening the protected area network. Namibia has also ratified a number of other environmental conventions such as the Convention to Combat Desertification, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) the Ramsar Convention and the World Heritage Convention all of which have direct implications for biodiversity conservation.

As indicated in the SPAN Project Document, the country has taken a number of significant steps towards realizing its commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), including strengthening the institutional framework for conservation and passing the necessary enabling legislation. The SPAN project fulfills a number of the objectives of the Convention, including the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity and the enhancement of national capacities to manage natural ecosystems. Specifically, the Project addresses elements 3 and 4 of the CBD COP VII decision on Protected Areas and the accompanying work programme (UNEP/CBD/COP/7/L.32). The SPAN project aims to: 1) develop an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected area management; 2) build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas; 3) ensure financial sustainability of protected areas; 4) improve the effectiveness of protected area management; and 5) assess and monitor the conservation status and trends in protected areas. All these are aspects covered under the CBD.

As stated in the Introduction section of this report, the SPAN project was conceptualized as a framework initiative for the multiplicity of projects and programmes that were being implemented by MET at that time with a view to maximizing the linkages across these programmes. The alignment between SPAN and the following programmes of the MET at the time of project design was because of this desire by government: the Protected Area Management Programme, the Protection and Management of Key Species and Natural Resources Programme and the Improving the Economic Value of Natural Resources and Protected Areas in the MET Jurisdiction Programme. Accordingly, the project paid particular attention to strengthening capacity at the systemic and institutional levels, and improving conditions and capacities needed to forge durable management partnerships with local government, communities and the private sector. Such partnerships were needed as part of efforts to strengthen capacity for protected area management. To ensure that capacity was enhanced within MET, the PMU that managed the implementation of this programme was located within the beneficiary Ministry. This co-location facilitated the institutionalization of project functions into the existing structures of the Ministry thereby ensuring the full involvement of key personnel in its various Directorates.

An important feature of country drivenness of the SPAN project was the fact that most of the staff that were recruited to work on the project were either nationals or residents of Namibia. In addition, most of the organizations that the project collaborated with were also managed by Namibian nationals. While most of these staff were young and had limited experience in project management and implementation, their involvement in the project has contributed to the building of a corps of Namibian professionals that will assume greater responsibilities on similar projects in future. Particular attention has also been paid to engaging young female University graduates who served as Project Assistants and Interns on the project. This was a commendable approach to project implementation as it addressed the issue of males dominating field based sectors such as environmental management. Progress in this regard was however somewhat compromised by the high staff turnover at Project Manager and at other levels.

3.6 Stakeholder Consultation

A comprehensive stakeholder analysis was undertaken during the project preparation phase. The MET held two national workshops and several local level consultative sessions with the identified stakeholders to ensure that:

- 1) stakeholders are fully aware of project objectives and outputs;
- 2) stakeholders participate in project design and in the determination of implementation arrangements; and
- 3) project development is integrated with ongoing and future initiatives both at the national and site levels.

The Midterm Review highlighted the principal stakeholders under the SPAN project as follows: key government agencies like the MET, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Ministry of Mines and Energy, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, regional government and traditional authorities, the NWR, residents within protected areas and neighbours including communal and commercial conservancies that lie adjacent to protected areas and private investors in and adjacent to the protected areas. Private sector entities that are important stakeholders to the SPAN project include: the Namibia Tourism Board, private tour operators, NGOs, the National Heritage Council, the Federation of Namibian Tourism Association, and the Namibia Professional Hunters Association. These stakeholders were assessed for their potential contribution to the project with their roles and responsibilities allocated in a comprehensive stakeholder involvement plan that was articulated in the Project Document.

These stakeholders will continue to be involved in project implementation through a comprehensive Knowledge Management System that has been developed to coordinate the management and dissemination of information related to MET's conservation programmes.

3.7 Linkages between the Project and other Interventions

UNDP/GEF financed the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) project, executed by the MET, to examine Namibia's institutional, systemic and individual level capacity to achieve global environmental goals under three conventions—UNFCCC, CBD and CCD. A number of recommendations pertinent to SPAN came out of the NCSA exercise. At the national level, priority areas for capacity building pertinent to this project identified in the NCSA include: **Institutional level:** 1) Building technical and scientific capacity within the government. The MET Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management and the Directorate of Scientific Services were identified as priorities in this regard.; 2) Strengthening data management systems; **Systemic Level:** 3) Simplifying and harmonizing laws, so that they are understood by all levels of society; 4) Strengthening the policy framework, pertaining to the CBD; 5) Improving enforcement of legislation, and stiffening fines; 6) Monitoring policy impacts; **Individual Level:** 7) Strengthening the capacity of MET staff to work with different stakeholders, agencies and communities and to handle conflicts appropriately.

Key recommendations pertinent to this project concerning the PAs include: 1) Fostering the partnerships between Etosha PA authorities and northern communities; 2) Formulating a park-neighbour policy, and developing joint park-neighbour activities; 3) Developing tourism attractions in communal areas adjacent to the PA; 4) Training of the Anti-Poaching Unit, park wardens and rangers in public relations and conflict resolution skills; and 5) Consolidating the infrastructure base and equipment inventory to facilitate service delivery.

UNDP/GEF is financing the Country Pilot Partnerships for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Programme. The programme addresses the systemic, institutional and individual capacity constraints to devising and implementing an integrated sustainable land management approach to combating land degradation. The overall goal of the project is to reduce and reverse the process of land degradation in Namibia. Four regions in the north central part of the country have so been designated pilot sites for the programme. As three of the four regions form parts of Etosha, there is great potential for achieving synergetic impact between SPAN and SLM.

There are several past and ongoing GEF projects involving Namibia that had particular relevance to the SPAN initiative. The Enabling Activities (both UNEP/GEF financed) include the preparation of the Biodiversity Country Study and National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. These efforts have contributed to priority setting for conservation, thus informing the development of this initiative.

World Bank/GEF financed the Namib Coast Biodiversity Conservation and Management Project (NACOMA), which was of significant relevance to the Strengthening the Protected Area Network Project. The Project objective was to mainstream biodiversity conservation into sustainable economic development through integrated coastal management in line with the GEF Strategic Priority “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape”. Coastal zone management has been promoted through a coastal zone-planning framework. The project’s geographical scope includes the Namibian coastline from the Orange River in the south to the Kunene River in the north. Interventions under NACOMA were scheduled to complement and add value to those spearheaded under SPAN. In particular, the support provided by NACOMA for the establishment and management of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) has yielded data that has been incorporated into the data management systems and Strategic PA Network Plan established through SPAN. In addition, NACOMA supported the integration of PA Management Plans for the Namib-Naukluft National Park, Spergebbiet NP, and Skeleton Coast Park developed through SPAN into the Integrated Coastal Zone Management framework for regional development planning. This was critical for the achievement of bio-regional level conservation objectives. The NACOMA project further supported capacity building for both regional councils and key MET staff, for integrated coastal zone management. This support will complemented the activities of SPAN at these sites, which focus on capacity building for PA specific management operations.

ICEMA, which was part funded by WB-GEF was aimed at strengthening community based natural resource management within communal conservancies. This included support for the development of 15 integrated conservancy management plans. The project also provided strategic support to the MET to improve its planning, implementation, monitoring and replication capacity in order to promote, develop and implement the National CBNRM Programme. As this project was expected to directly or indirectly improve management in the 17 conservancies adjacent to State Protected Areas, the initiative was highly complementary to SPAN. The project included two demonstration sites (Kwando and Ehirovipuka) which are within the Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili Complex and Etosha –Skeleton Coast corridor respectively.

Close coordination among the above projects was promoted through the convening of regular meetings and frequent email telephone exchanges between the various coordinators and GEF Implementing Agencies. MET assumed responsibility for ensuring the activities of the various initiatives were closely

coordinated through frequent contact through the Project Management Group (PMG), the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and information dissemination.

In South Africa, the WB/GEF financed the Richtersveld Community Biodiversity Conservation Project (RCBCP). The aim of the project was to put in place a strong system of community based biodiversity conservation to protect the globally significant biodiversity in the Richtersveld National Park, which accounts for 31% of the Richtersveld Transfrontier Park. The project support, *inter alia*, formulation of the integrated development plan and environmental management plan, development of community conservancy and biodiversity-based businesses. Close collaboration with this project was maintained with respect to the field demonstration site.

3.8 Monitoring and Evaluation

The SPAN project was implemented under the direction of a PMU and PAC both of which met as scheduled and produced minutes of their proceedings. The Project Management Team, UNDP Country Office and Government of Namibia conducted periodic monitoring of the project since its inception. Mission report back reports were produced after each visit by UNDP Country Office. These visits were however limited in number due to the high costs associated with travel across Namibia to the individual demonstration sites. Project Implementation Progress reports were produced on schedule as were Project Annual Reports. The UNDP Regional Coordination Office has also performed project monitoring responsibilities as evidenced by comments provided on the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs).

Specific mention needs to be made of the comprehensive manner in which the SPAN PMU has documented all the actions and activities that have been undertaken since project inception. It was therefore easy for the evaluator to find information they were looking for as well as to form opinions regarding project implementation. This is a sign of effective project management on the part of the PMU which provides a lesson for other projects.

3.9 Project Budget and Financial Planning

The total project Budget is indicated as N\$ 46.8 million. This was made up of a total GEF contribution of US\$ 8.55 million which includes a sum of US\$ 0.35 million PDF B funding for project development and co-financing of US\$ 38.4 million.

Co-financing for the SPAN project was made up of UNDP managed funding as well as partner managed funding as indicated in the table below. All the co-financing indicated has been committed to project activities.

Financial management and reporting were conducted as per UNDP GEF and Government guidelines. Independent annual audits were conducted throughout the life of the project as per GEF requirements and signed off by the Auditor General's office.

Table 1: Financial Overview SPAN Project

Name of Partner or Contributor	Nature of Contributor	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF B)	Amount committed in Project Document	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization	Estimated Total Disbursement by 31 December 2006	Estimated Total Disbursement by 31 December 2007	Estimated Total Disbursement by 31 December 2008	Estimated Total Disbursement by 30 June 2009	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
GEF Contribution	GEF	0.35 m	8.20 m	0	0.35	2.74 m	3.97 m	4.31 m	8.55 m
Cash Co financing – UNDP Managed									
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency	0.08 m	0.3 m	0		0.15 m	0.19 m		0.30 m
USAID	Bilateral	0.08 m	0.18 m	0		0.174 m	0.174 m		0.174 m
MET/GPTF (Procurement Support Project)	National Government	0	0	0.093 m		0.086 m	0.093 m		0.093 m
Cash Co financing – Partner Managed									999
MET	National Government	0.28 m	24.50 m	0		7.74 m	12.76 m		24.78 m

KfW	Bilateral	0	3.25 m ¹	4.55 m ²		0.35 m	0.49 m		7.80 m
GTZ	Bilateral	0	0.10 m	0		0.10 m	0.10 m		0.10 m
Conservation International	NGO	0	0.91 m	0		0.33 m	0.91 m		0.91 m
WWF – UK	NGO	0	1.49 m	0		0.21 m	0.71 m		1.49 m
NAMDEB	Private Sector	0	0.40 m	0		0.12 m	0.40 m		0.40 m
In-Kind Co financing									
MET	National Government	0	2.30 m	0					2.30 m
Total Co financing		0.44 m	33.43 m	4.643 m		9.26 m	15.827 m		38.437m
Total for Project		0.79 m	41.63 m	4.643 m		12.00 m	19.797 m		46.897 m

The SPAN project has produced comprehensive financial reports which record a very high expenditure of budgeted funds of between 82% and 96% on a quarterly basis and is therefore likely to achieve expected total disbursement by end of project.

¹ € 2.5 million originally committed at the current exchange rate of US\$ 1 = € 0.77

² € 3.5 million top up funding at the current exchange rate of US\$ 1 = € 0.77

4.0 RESULTS TO DATE

This section discusses the Project achievements at the end of the project implementation period as presented in the Table below which is adapted from the Project :Logical Framework. Project implementation strictly followed the Logical Framework with ammendments to targets and indicators recommended at Midterm stage being incorporated as appropriate. As a result of this, it was easy to relate project achievements to the baselines established at project start up.

The general conclusion of the Terminal Evaluation is that the project has been **Highly Successful (HS)** in addressing the constraints to management effectiveness in Namibia's Parks estate that were identified at project conceptualisation. Project achievements at Objective and Outcome level are discussed in the paragraphs below.

Table 2: Results at End of Project

Project Strategy																					
Goal		Sustainable management of renewable natural resources protects biodiversity while contributing to equitable economic and social development.																			
PERFORMANCE AT OBJECTIVE LEVEL																					
	Indicator	Status at Mid-term		End of Project Target		Achievement at End of Project/ Comment															
Objective of the project: Increased Management effectiveness of the national PA network for biodiversity conservation.	1. Net improvement in Management effectiveness for PA land. These PAs will move to a higher category of management effectiveness using the following definition of NAMETT (Namibia METT) categories: > 50..... <i>High</i> 40 - 49 <i>Intermediate</i> Less than 40 ... <i>Low</i>	Baseline NAMETT results are as follows:		50% of land managed as PA will have moved to a higher NAMETT category.		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total Land Area</th> <th>Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>105,79 sq. km (83%)</td> <td>High</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21,041sq. km (16%)</td> <td>Intermediate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,093 sq km (1%)</td> <td>Low</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Net improvement in management effectiveness in 98% of all Protected Area land. *NAMETT is not appropriate for measuring process and outputs.</p>	Total Land Area	Category	105,79 sq. km (83%)	High	21,041sq. km (16%)	Intermediate	1,093 sq km (1%)	Low							
		Total Land Area	Category																		
105,79 sq. km (83%)	High																				
21,041sq. km (16%)	Intermediate																				
1,093 sq km (1%)	Low																				
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total land Area</th> <th>Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>14,675sq. km (13%)</td> <td>High</td> </tr> <tr> <td>57,769 sq. km (53%)</td> <td>Medium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37,655 sq. km (34%)</td> <td>Low</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total land Area	Category	14,675sq. km (13%)	High	57,769 sq. km (53%)	Medium	37,655 sq. km (34%)	Low											
Total land Area	Category																				
14,675sq. km (13%)	High																				
57,769 sq. km (53%)	Medium																				
37,655 sq. km (34%)	Low																				
	2. Percentage representation of the 6 biomes in the PA system.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Unit = % covered by PA system</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Biome</th> <th>Baseline</th> <th>Midterm Achievement</th> <th>EOP Target</th> <th>EoP Projected (2012)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Namib Desert</td> <td>69.43</td> <td>75.32</td> <td>76.54</td> <td>79.54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Unit = % covered by PA system					Biome	Baseline	Midterm Achievement	EOP Target	EoP Projected (2012)	Namib Desert	69.43	75.32	76.54	79.54	S
Unit = % covered by PA system																					
Biome	Baseline	Midterm Achievement	EOP Target	EoP Projected (2012)																	
Namib Desert	69.43	75.32	76.54	79.54																	

			Nama Karoo	5.03	5.03	10.00	6.41	
			Lakes and Salt pans	95.76	95.76	95.76	95.76	
			Acacia tree and shrub Savanna	4.5	4.5	10.00	4.70	
			Broadleaved tree and wood Savanna	7.79	7.91	20.00	7.91	
			Succulent Karoo	11.01	90.34	91.34	90.34	
Not much has changed as the proclamation of the Kunene People's Park was not proclaimed due to lack of agreement between communities and th Government on the basis upon which this could be done.								
Overall rating Objective Level								HS
PERFORMANCE AT OUTCOME LEVEL								
	Indicator	Status at Mid-term		End of Project Target		Achievement at end of Project/ Comment		Ratin g
Outcome1: Improve d Systemic capacity provides the enabling framework for enhancing PA management effectiveness.	1. Creative strategies are developed and implemented using participatory mechanisms to ensure that the needs weighted average level reaches 0.48 at end of project	Needs-weighted average 0.33		0.48		Errors were discovered during implementation and PMU has recommended that the indicator be changed.		MS
	2. Protected Area and Wildlife Management Bill and development of subsidiary regulations	The Parks and Wildlife Management Bill is under discussion.		The Parks and Wildlife Management Bill is approved and subsidiary policies developed (amended from enacted to approved within the MET at mid-term).		The Bill has been reviewed by the Attorney General's Office and comments sent to MET. Financial support has been provided for the development of associated regulations. .		S

	providing a legal framework for increasing management affectiveness.					
	3. Budget amount appropriated for PA management will have increased to 70% with additional revenue from park usage fees and a sustainable financing mechanism.	The current available budget for PA management is about N\$ 40 million per year as opposed to projected N\$106 million per year to realize adequate management.		Budget increased by 70% from park usage and concession fees.	Due to Park Valuation Study of 2004(updated in 2008)Government budget for PA management has increased by 310% since 200 with Ministry of Finance approving the retention of 25% of Park entrance fees through the Game Products Trust Fund. Leveraged funding from other sources: (kfW, EU, MCA, and USFWS (+/-US 50 million since 2006) End of project targets have therefore been exceeded.	HS
	4. Functioning knowledge management system will have been institutionalized and made accessible to a wide range of conservation partners including MET staff, line ministries, communities, and local and	Knowledge management system developed and in use at demonstration sites.		Functioning knowledge management system is institutionalised	Incident Book for park level monitoring which was modelled on the Event \book system developed for use by Conservaces has been developed and consolidated with CONINFO system. The system is in use at Park level and has been institutionalised at management level within MET where data collected through it is used for planning purposes.. Brochures and fact sheets on Parks produced (branding process) ; Project has continued supporting the publication of the quarterly	HS

	international NGOs and individuals, to ensure sustainability and replicability of the achievements and lessons learned.				Park Newsletter (Sandpaper).; These are popular with private sector. The Ministry website has been established and is fully functional. A knowledge Management Strategy has been developed for MET. End of project target has been exceeded. .	
Overall Rating Outcome 1						HS
Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for PA management are strengthened, resulting in more effective use of financial and human resources.	1. Devolution of decision-making functions including financial management tested in the priority parks, resulting in more effective staffing and budget use. By EoP the average length of the procurement process will be 14 days.	Average length of procurement process is 30days.		Average length of the procurement process will be 14 days.	The mid-term target has been achieved. The average length of procurement process has been reduced to 14 days. due to decentralisation of all procurements less than N\$ 10,000 to individual budget holders. A cost centre approach for financial management has been adopted, enabling the park managers to better budget and keep track of expenditures. In the proposed new Ministerial organizational structure, it is envisaged that financial management functions will be devolved to the regions.	HS
	2. Individual performance M&E system is institutionalised	Training and M&E system was under development in line with developments		Average staff skill level is 60% of potential effectiveness.	Skills levels among staff have increased to 61% therefore exceeding EoP target. Staff training is now aligned to staff	HS

	and used effectively in the management of incentive mechanisms and career development. A stratified sample of supervisor-led skills rating shows average staff skill level has risen to 60%.	under the Prime Minister's Office.			development. Training manuals currently under development with support from the project. Performance Management System has now been launched in conjunction with the Office of the Prime Minister through which staff in all Directorates are expected to sign up to Performance Agreements and Personal Development Plans. Staff appraisals based on these plans started in 2010.	
	3. Use of business methods at individual park level, and existence of a PA performance monitoring system.	There is no business planning at individual PA level and no institutionalized PA performance monitoring system.		Business planning becomes an integral part of Protected Area management supported by a Monitoring and Evaluation system at the individual park level. These systems will have been adopted at the four field demonstration sites.	Business planning is now an integral part of park planning with plans developed for Etosha National Park, /Ai-/Ais, the Sperrgebiet National Park, the BMM Complex Parks.. Training in the use of business planning as a park management and budgeting tool has been provided. DPWM has adopted NAMETT as a protected areas management performance tool .	HS
	4. Formalised career planning will have become part of METs human resources strategy..	Formalized career planning does not take place.		70% of staff have agreed MET career development plans involving training opportunities and incentive mechanisms..	Career planning is now part of staff performance management systems. All staff at MET have completed personal development plans which will be aligned to individual personal progression on the MET organisational structure.	HS
	5. All draft management plans to be	Only Etosha National Park has an approved management plan		All draft management plans to be approved at Ministry	Project has collected all draft management plans for Skeleton Coast, /Ai-//Ais, Sperrgebiet and	S

	updated approved and implemented in all Protected Areas in demonstration sites.					the BBM Parks and submitted them to MET for approval. A guideline for development of management plans was supported and finalised. This will guide all future PA management plan development.																																												
Overall Assessment Outcome 2							HS																																											
Outcome 3: PA management know-how is expanded and reinforced through innovative field management demonstration	1. Management effectiveness index of PAs at demonstration sites will have increased as below with a minimum ranking of intermediate for all sites.		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>Baseline</th> <th>Midterm Actual</th> <th>EoP Target</th> <th>EoP Achievement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>/Ai- //Ais</td> <td>28</td> <td>41</td> <td>40</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bwabwata (Caprivi Mahango)</td> <td>35</td> <td>59</td> <td>48</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Etosha</td> <td>50</td> <td>52.5</td> <td>60</td> <td>60.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mamili</td> <td>31</td> <td>51</td> <td>45</td> <td>55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mudumu</td> <td>36</td> <td>54</td> <td>51</td> <td>63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skeleton Coast</td> <td>44</td> <td>45.4</td> <td>55</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sperrgebiet</td> <td>35</td> <td>59</td> <td>60</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Waterberg Plateau Park</td> <td>50</td> <td>62</td> <td>60</td> <td>69</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site	Baseline	Midterm Actual	EoP Target	EoP Achievement	/Ai- //Ais	28	41	40	49	Bwabwata (Caprivi Mahango)	35	59	48	62	Etosha	50	52.5	60	60.5	Mamili	31	51	45	55	Mudumu	36	54	51	63	Skeleton Coast	44	45.4	55	60	Sperrgebiet	35	59	60	64	Waterberg Plateau Park	50	62	60	69	Most initiatives at demonstration sites compliment activities from past interventions or those of other on-going initiatives. Issues of attribution for results achieved arise even though this was how SPAN was designed. Examples are designation of Sperrgebiet National Park also claimed by NACOMA and activities in BMM Complex also being supported by IRDNC and BMM Parks.	S
			Site	Baseline	Midterm Actual	EoP Target	EoP Achievement																																											
			/Ai- //Ais	28	41	40	49																																											
			Bwabwata (Caprivi Mahango)	35	59	48	62																																											
			Etosha	50	52.5	60	60.5																																											
			Mamili	31	51	45	55																																											
			Mudumu	36	54	51	63																																											
			Skeleton Coast	44	45.4	55	60																																											
			Sperrgebiet	35	59	60	64																																											
			Waterberg Plateau Park	50	62	60	69																																											
<p>> 50..... High 40 - 49 Intermediate Less than 40 ... Low</p>																																																		
Overall Assessment Outcome 3							S																																											
OVERALL PROJECT ASSESSMENT							HS																																											

HS-Highly Successful; S-Successful; MS-Moderately Successful; MU-Moderately Unsuccessful; U-Unsuccessful; HU-Highly Unsuccessful

4.1 Results at Objective Level

The objective of the SPAN project is stated as: **Increased Management effectiveness of the national PA network for biodiversity conservation.** Management Effectiveness under the project was measured according to scores realized through the allocation of values to answers to a list of predetermined questions developed as part of the METT/NAMETT. At the objective level, the indicator is “net improvement in management effectiveness for PA land” with progress measured according to the increase in PA land areas that have moved into a higher category of management effectiveness using the following definition from NAMETT categories: High - >50, Intermediate – 40-49 and Low – Less than 40.

The MidTerm evaluation of the SPAN project showed that the project had already exceeded the management effectiveness targets set for the end of the project (50%). A possible explanation for this situation was provided at the MidTerm evaluation stage where it was suggested that this was because the parameters used to measure management effectiveness were limited in scope. If parameters that measure ecosystem health had been included in the assessment, the situation might have been different.

A second indicator of progress at Objective level was the extent of representation of the different biomes found in Namibia in the PA network. By the end of the project the broad leaved tree and woody savanna biome that characterises the region between Etosha National Park and Skeleton Coast National Park had not been promulgated as a PA due to lack of consensus among different stakeholders regarding the approach to the management of the PA. However, Dorob National Park linking the Namib Naukluft and Skeleton Coast National Parks was promulgated in 2010 through the NACOMA project. This effectively brought the whole of the Namibian coastal area under protection and increased representation of the desert biome. The numeric indicators used to measure progress towards the achievement of the project objective had the inherent limitation of being unusable for measuring processes such as improvements in the status of conservation of PAs.. This limitation has been identified as a major shortcoming of the METT, which is a tracking tool that GEF use globally to assess improved management of protected areas. Despite the inherent limitations as described above, the evaluator’s assessment was that the project had been **Highly Successful (S)** in meeting its Objective.

4.2 Results at Outcome Level

The results achieved under each of the project outcomes are discussed below.

Outcome 1: *Improved systemic capacity provides the enabling framework for enhancing PA management effectiveness.*

Systemic capacity refers to the ability of national level management entities to introduce and institute policy, institutional and resource (financial and human resources) interventions that facilitate effective management of PAs. Weak institutions, poor policies, lack of information/knowledge about PA management and inadequate resource allocation were identified as constraints to the management of Namibia’s PAs. It was expected that addressing these constraints would contribute to an improvement in the management of the nation’s PAs. The SPAN project therefore focussed on developing an enabling policy environment, training of PA managers in PA management and financial management and

demonstrating the contribution of national parks to the nation's development as a way of encouraging the allocation of adequate financial resources to the management of these assets.

The Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill that has been under development for the past twelve years is in the final stages of approval with MET having received comments on the document from the Attorney General's office. Complimentary regulations and policies such as the Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict, Parks and Neighbours and Concessioning had been developed and being implemented by the end of the project. Training in park management had been administered to Park Managers thereby enhancing their management skills. All PAs had been set up as cost centres with devolved responsibility for their operational budgets resulting in improved efficiency in areas such as procurement and financial management. Studies conducted in 2004 and 2008 to quantify the contribution of the PA estate to national development have resulted in increased resource allocations for PA management. It is estimated that budgetary allocations for this purpose have increased by up to 310% which is well above the 70% target for the end of project. Even though most of the increase has been invested in infrastructure development, it will be counted as showing increased attention by the government to PA management. An additional feature of increased resource allocations to PA management was the decision by government to allow the MET to retain 25% of annual park entrance fees and make these available through the GPTF for various projects.

As observed at Mid-term, a framework for knowledge management has been created through the introduction of the Incident Book System at PA level. This system enables Park managers to track sightings of wildlife species and the recording of incidents that have a bearing on management decisions. Interviews with senior Officers withn MET confirmed that the data collected at Park level through this system is used for park planning. The government of Namibia was also reeported to have assimilated this planning tool and made budgetary provision for it in the post SPAN project era. This has assured the sustainability of the process. The system has also been acknowledged as a useful tool for involving community members in monitoring their own resources and has been adapted to suit situations in other parts of the region. The Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) approach that was used in community-level monitoring under the Biokavango Project and also under the Southern Africa Regional Environment Project in Botswana was modelled upon the Incident Book Management System.

More success has been achived with the production of Park brochures and park branding which have increased awareness of the PA estate among Namibians in general. The Project has mobilised funding and contracted a consultant to develop a Knowledge Management Strategy for MET to address information and communication gaps within MET. The continued production of the newsletter, Sandpaper has provided an additional avenue for information dissemination. This publication has proved to be extremely popular with all stakeholder groups in Namibia. Government has committed to continue publication of Sandpaper, given its wildlife focus, and have it complement Earthbound, the already existing Ministry newsletter which focusses on broader envieionmental issues.

The evaluatorrated the Project Performance under this Outcome as **Highly Successful (S)**.

Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for PA management are strengthened, resulting in more effective use of financial and human resources.

Capacity for protected area management under this Outcome was interpreted to cover issues such as procurement, financial and human resources management and career planning, and business planning.

MET has committed to restructuring and devolution of decision making functions including financial management to park level. All the Parks at the demonstration sites have been designated as cost centres

with control of their own budgets on the back of the financial management training referred to under Outcome 1 above. The Financial Transformation Advisor introduced pilot initiatives in priority parks focusing on the management of procurement processes. The turn around period for procurement has now been cut from more than 60 days to 14 days.

The Concession Unit that had just been established at the MTE stage was fully functional at the end of the project. At MTE up to 15 concessions had been awarded through this effort with one such concession awarded directly to a community adjacent to Khaudum National Park in the north east of the country. Other concessions had also been awarded for lodge development in the Namib Naukluft Park.

Devolution of control over procurement and budget needs to be done in concert with human resource management skills enhancement. The personnel performance management system introduced in 2006 was augmented by the efforts of the Human Resources Transformation Advisor who had assisted MET with more focused attention to individual and institutional skills enhancement through developing a Performance Management System in concert with the pilot national programme that was being implemented at the Office of the Prime Minister. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, a training task force had been established within the DPWM and a training plan drawn up. As a result of this plan up to thirty training opportunities involving more than three hundred (300) staff have been offered. In addition to training, a number of incentive schemes have been developed in order to motivate staff in their positions. All staff at DPWM had developed personal career development plans which was a major improvement on the status at Mid-term evaluation where these were not in place resulting in reduced staff morale.

Park managers interviewed during the Terminal Evaluation noted that the Field Staff Award Scheme was particularly appreciated by junior staff at Park level who felt that they were being recognised for their efforts. As stated at Midterm, park planning was made a special area of focus for the project as the process was understood to have implications for policy development. Park Management Plans have so far been developed and adopted for Etosha National Park, /Ai-/Ais and Sperrgebiet National Parks, BMM and Kunene Peoples Park. The evaluation however noted the delays that were being experienced with the approval process as these plans were expected to be approved by the Minister on the advice of a Ministerial Policy Committee. Even though Park planning has policy implications, it still is an operational issue which should be handled at the appropriate managerial level. The approval of park plans should therefore be left to management at Permanent Secretary level and not be elevated to the political level.

Training in business planning has also been offered and reference materials on the training produced for use by park managers into the future. While there has been significant movement towards institutionalising business plans as park management strategies, the evaluator's assessment was that generally park managers still operated under the control of their supervisors and did not necessarily have the liberty to implement their plans without approval from above. However, the restructuring of the MET which will devolve financial and management decision making to the regional level was almost finalised at the time of the TE. The expectation was therefore that with this new structure in place, Park managers will start using business planning as a management tool for their individual parks.

The work done by both the FTA and HRTA since the Midterm evaluation has laid a very strong foundation for the enhancement of PA management in Namibia. Enhanced decision making and financial management and devolution of responsibility for procurement have engendered a sense of responsibility among park level staff and should improve when the restructuring of the MET is implemented. Skills enhancement has also been effectively delivered with all staff now aware of their individual career paths. These initiatives together with the institutionalisation of business planning and the introduction of park

level management planning should go a long way towards effective deployment of financial and human resources to the management effort and therefore enhance management effectiveness of Namibia's PA estate. The evaluator adjudges the project as having exceeded all targets set for the end of the project under this outcome. Performance under the Outcome was therefore rated as **Highly Successful (HS)**.

Outcome 3: PA management know-how is expanded and reinforced through innovative field management demonstration.

The SPAN project established very successful demonstration sites at four sites around the country that were facilitated by Technical Coordinators until just before the Terminal Evaluation. The intention behind the establishment of these demonstration sites was to demonstrate innovative park management. The efforts of field coordinators at the /Ai-//Ais/Sperrgebiet demonstration site and at BMM Complex were particularly recognised by both MET staff and other stakeholders as these sites demonstrated a clearly new way of management of PAs that had hitherto been lacking within MET. Communication between Park managers and other stakeholders had improved dramatically as a result of the introduction of innovative management approaches such as Park Advisory Committee in the south and the fostering of continued collaboration with initiatives that had already been on the ground in the BMM Complex. The failure to agree on a way forward with regards the management arrangement for the Northwest Parks including Kunene People's Park detracted somewhat from the achievements of the demonstration sites. However this was more than adequately compensated for by the results achieved at the Waterberg Plateau National Park where management was improved over a relatively short time span through the interventions of the SPAN project.

The evaluator picked up anecdotal evidence of some stakeholders insinuating that SPAN had not in and of itself generated any new system of management even in the demonstration sites as the Project had piggy backed on already on-going initiatives. In some instances it was stated that SPAN had contributed very small amounts of finances for the development of projects and therefore could not claim attribution for the results that had been realised. The evaluator's assessment of these sentiments is that SPAN was never introduced to create new ways of managing the PA estate in Namibia. Instead the project was introduced to strengthen management systems in PAs towards the creation of a network of these systems, which the project did quite effectively. It is therefore expected that the foundation laid by SPAN over the past six years will be used to effectively enhance PA management into the future.

The evaluator's rating of performance under this Outcome is **Successful (S)**.

On the basis of the ratings recorded for the three project Outcomes, the overall project rating is **Highly Successful (S)**.

5.0 PROJECT IMPACTS, RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY BEYOND THE PROJECT LIFE CYCLE

5.1 Project Impact

The evaluation makes the observation that projects like SPAN which target changing the way people and institutions do business require long implementation time frames before their impacts are felt on the ground. After a period of six years, what shows on the ground is mainly outputs and not outcomes. The evaluator therefore concluded that the outputs of SPAN are set to generate long term impacts if they are institutionalised within government management systems. The recently approved MET restructuring provides an opportunity for such institutionalization of the outputs of SPAN within the operations of the Ministry.

5.2 Risk Analysis

A number of risks against the realisation of project outcomes and objectives were identified at project conceptualisation. The evaluator assessed each of these risks to establish the extent to which they still held at the end of the project. Table 3 below summarises the results of the assesment of these risks by the evaluator. With the exception of the risk of delayed development of the Parks and Wildlife Act, all the other risks did not hold as the project instituted measures to mitigate them.

Table 3: Risk Assessment

Risk Identified	Rating	Proposed Mitigation	Status at TE
External pressures on PAs Increase	Low	PA management plans will be integrated into regional development plans. Improved inter-agency coordination at the national and regional level, will ensure better alignment of development activities, to reduce this risk. The strengthened M&E system will provide an early warning of increasing pressure.	While there have not been any direct external pressures on the PA system, there also hasn't been much cross-sectoral coordination and integration. Continued lack of political and procedural recognition of commercial conservancies could constitute a threat to the integrity of conservation areas in the event of land redistribution.
Delayed process of enacting the Parks and	Medium	Continuous policy dialogue between UNDP CO and the MET to	The potential negative implications of delayed passing of the Parks and

Wildlife Bill		ensure that progress in finalising the draft is sustained. MET cannot enact the bill itself, and so is reliant on other arms of government. This risk will be mitigated through the PAC, which involves other government agencies, as well as the strategic use of lobbying and communications.	Wildlife Bill have been averted by the development of associated policies which will be useful in the implementation of the Bill/Act when it is finally enacted.
Lung disease/anthrax spread at an alarming rate	M	In addition to MAWF's existing inoculation programme for livestock, the MET will improve preparedness for an epidemic through compilation of disease profiles for PAs and training in response measures. An early warning system with neighbouring countries will also be instituted.	No outbreaks of lung disease experienced in Namibia during the course of the project. Risk rating was therefore reclassified to L.
Qualified and dedicated people are not available within the MET or for outside recruitment.	M	Institutionalisation of training and incentive mechanisms, coupled with a stringent performance evaluation system will capacitate existing staff members. PA branding and reclassification of certain posts will also attract qualified and experienced people to work for the PAs	Training programmes offered to over 300 Parks personnel through the capacity enhancement programme.. Most of those trained continue to work in the Directorate. Qualified and experienced staff are still not readily available for recruitment. The restructuring of MET will demonstrate the exact situation as qualified staff will be needed to fill the new

			positions that have been created.
Mortality and morbidity rates from HIV/AIDS related illnesses increases among the PA staff	S	Development of institutional HIV/AIDS policy, and education and well-being programme will improve the welfare of infected Staff and decrease infection rates over a long term. HIV/AIDS succession planning based on the thorough investigation of the current situation will minimise the impact on PA management of staff mortality and morbidity.	A comprehensive HIV AIDS mitigation programme was developed as part of the SPAN succession plan. In addition family-friendly staff deployment has been adopted by MET.

Risk rating – H (High Risk), S (Substantial Risk), M (Modest Risk), and L (Low Risk).

5.3 Sustainability of Project Outcomes

The potential for sustainability of the project outcomes was assessed from the institutional, financial, and environmental perspectives.

5.3.1 Institutional Sustainability

The SPAN project has been embedded within the structures of MET where the PMU was colocated with the Department of Parks and Wildlife Management. Some of the outputs from the project implementation were therefore directly integrated into the reporting and management systems of the Ministry thereby increasing the likelihood of institutional sustainability. A good example of outputs that were integrated into the MET management systems were the Concessioning unit, financial management training and procurement management. Already, there are results that are beginning to show with the Concessioning Unit having awarded new concessions to previously disadvantaged Namibians in a number of Parks around the country. This will compliment the results of the CBNRM initiatives which have been in operation around the country since the attainment of independence. Overtures have also been made to integrate community-based tourism initiatives in the southern parks through the establishment of transfrontier conservation programmes around //Ai-//Ais and Sperrgebiet National Parks.

The establishment of a training committee to oversee personnel training in MET was intended to ensure continued skills enhancement among the Ministry staff within the context of the government wide performance management system that is being rolled out from the Prime Minister's Office. The ultimate result of this is expected to be a Ministry with enhanced capacity for managing the PA system in Namibia.

The Terminal Evaluation has concluded that commendable progress has been made towards the achievement of enhanced capacity at national and local level for managing PAs. An area where there might be a short fall is that of integration of planning processes into regional and local governance structures as well as at the NPC. MET will need to ensure that these gaps are addressed. The overall assessment is that Institutional Sustainability is **Likely (L)**

5.3.2 Financial Sustainability

Projects supported by external agencies should never be considered as alternatives to government funding of development programmes. The SPAN project provided initial funding for strengthening institutional capacity for park management which has now been followed up with government increasing budgetary allocations for PA management and authorising the retention of 25% of park entry fees for re-investment in park operations.

Government has also committed to restructuring MET with provision for devolution of management decision making to the regional level where most of the outputs of SPAN will be implemented. When taken together with the decision to promote a multi-sectoral approach to development planning, it is expected that more financial resources will be made available for the implementation of programmes whose development will have been influenced by the SPAN project.

Overall therefore, the Government of the Republic of Namibia has decided to institutionalise and fund the outputs from the implementation of the SPAN project. Further, the government continues to mobilise additional resources from other donor organisations, notably MCA and GIZ in support of PA management. All these will contribute to increased financial sustainability of the outputs of SPAN. It is therefore **Likely (L)** that the outputs from SPAN will be sustainable into the future.

5.3.3 Social Sustainability

PA management is being developed alongside already on-going initiatives such as CBNRM which located conservation at the heart of social and economic development in Namibia. The programme has been accepted and adopted by community groups who have established Communal Area Conservancies that straddle the country. PAs constitute the core of resource conservation processes in Namibia and are recognised as such by community groups and the private sector. Effective management of these PAs will therefore be recognised as important for the continued integrity of the conservation movement by all sectors of the economy in Namibia. Herein lies the potential for social sustainability of the outputs of SPAN. Social Sustainability is therefore **Likely (L)**.

5.3.4 Environmental Sustainability

The value of the PA system to Namibia's economy was well documented through the Park Valuation Study conducted in 2004 and updated in 2008. The findings of this study have awakened unprecedented interest in PA management within government as evidenced by the increases in resource allocation for the conservation effort from central treasury. Namibia has also long recognised the role of protected areas in its development as exemplified by the extent of PAs in the country. Recently Dorob National Park was promulgated as a protected area effectively becoming the missing piece in the protection of the country's entire coastal zone. The Outputs from SPAN are therefore being produced against already fertile ground within which they can be planted and nurtured.

Namibia's contribution to the international conservation discourse will be enhanced by the achievements of SPAN which will contribute to improved understanding of the intricate linkages between conservation and development. There are therefore identifiable global environmental benefits to be drawn from SPAN which will make the environmental sustainability of the project **Likely (L)**.

On the basis of the assessment above the evaluator is convinced that the sustainability of the outputs of the SPAN Project is **Likely (L)**.

5.4 Potential for Replication of Project Outcomes

The design of SPAN included pilot projects in demonstration sites which were intended to serve as laboratories for the generation of lessons and best practices in effective PA management for replication to other parts of Namibia and other parts of the world where GEF funded similar projects.

The expansion of PA coverage in Namibia which has seen the whole of the country's coastal zone being designated as PAs is evidence that the efforts of SPAN are being replicated to other regions of the country. At the regional level, Tanzania is mobilising for the implementation of the Strengthening the Protected Area Network of Southern Tanzania which is intended to adopt a landscape approach to include Parks and community conservation initiatives in that part of the country. This project is modelled on the SPAN project. This initiative will herald a new era for conservation in this area which is rich in biodiversity.

The Incident Book Monitoring system which was developed in the northwest and north east parks has now been adopted in all PA systems. The system has also been adapted to Botswana conditions as a Management Oriented Monitoring System under the recently concluded Biokavango Project as well as the Southern Africa Regional Environment Programme being implemented in the Okavango Basin. As Namibia engages with other Southern African states in the implementation of the Kanango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Project, the lessons learnt from the implementation of the SPAN project can be used to inform the planning of the conservation initiatives envisaged under this major programme.

5.5 Information Dissemination and Communications

The SPAN project instituted a broad based information and communicational system which targeted various relevant stakeholders. These systems included pamphlets, and policy briefs. The project's flagship information dissemination tool was the project's Newsletter, Sandpaper which was very popular among a broad range of stakeholders from high school students to the corporate world.

The project also instituted a stakeholder dialogue forum called Park Talk at which various topics relevant to its objectives were motivated by various speakers and discussed. The outcomes from these discussions were used to inform on-going project management. Most importantly though these discussions contributed to increased information dissemination and understanding of the SPAN project among the general public.

5.6 The Use of Technology

The SPAN project used a whole range of technologies to advance its goals. Conventional technologies such as printed publications, video recordings, a project website and CDs were used to package the project outputs. Towards the end of the project various forms of social media were being considered for disseminating the SPAN story.

6.0 LESSONS LEARNT

In addition to the results discussed above, the project has also yielded lessons that are presented in this report for consideration in the design and implementation of projects and programmes targeting similar concerns that GEF might fund in other countries and regions worldwide.

1. Improving management effectiveness in PAs has many facets and there is need to ensure that all the aspects of management effectiveness are understood by all stakeholders at the beginning of projects aiming to address this issue.

Consultations with stakeholders involved in the implementation of SPAN revealed that some stakeholders had different expectations of the project from those held by executing agencies such as the PMU. Some senior government officials had expected that SPAN would support the development of Park infrastructure as most of the infrastructure in Parks was in need of rehabilitation at the time the project was introduced. Infrastructure development was therefore considered an important component of improvement of management effectiveness. SPAN was however focused on the "soft" aspects of management effectiveness such as capacity building and did not support infrastructure development resulting in these stakeholders adjudging the project to have been less successful than it is generally perceived to have been. It is however important to note that additional funding for the rehabilitation of parks has been leveraged from other sources such as kfW and the Millennium Change Compact.

2. There is need to rationalise project goals with those of successor projects to ensure that transition from one project to another is smooth.

The SPAN project was implemented against a background of numerous projects that targeted developments within Namibia's protected areas and in the areas surrounding these areas. Examples of such projects include Namibia Coast Conservation and Management (NACOMA) project, Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management (ICEMA) and the Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (CPP NAM ISLM). Projects such as Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Area Initiative (NAM-PLACE) and the recently GEF approved project that will focus on

financing National Parks have also since been mobilised and or agreed to but there does not seem to be any direct linkage between these projects and SPAN despite the fact that they are focussed on the same area that SPAN was. As the lessons and experiences from the implementation of the SPAN project are collated they need to be appropriately packaged and used to inform this follow-on work.

3. There is need to ensure that all projects are mainstreamed into the national government initiatives as projects should not be considered as alternatives to government programmes.

Mainstreaming of development projects into national development planning processes helps assure sustainability of the outcomes of these projects. The evaluation found little evidence of SPAN having worked with local government and the National Planning Commission where national development planning is coordinated. The period between the evaluation and the official project close out should therefore be used to synthesise results that can be used to inform these planning processes. Adequate budgetary provisions should be made at MET to ensure the integration of the outcomes of the SPAN project into overall national planning processes.

4. Projects that deal with biodiversity management and access to land and other resources cut across various sectors which all need to be involved in their implementation for effective institutionalisation of project outputs and outcomes into the national development planning processes..

The Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management will need to assume the role of champion in order that the outputs of SPAN can be used to influence development planning in Namibia. Overtures will need to be made to institutions such as the National Planning Commission, the Ministries of Local Government and Lands as well as civil society organisations to ensure that they are involved in the planning and implementation of programmes that guarantee the sustainable management of Namibia's protected area system.

5. Projects that engage nationals and residents of recipient countries as managers contribute to the building of capacity for project management in country.

Namibia has received large amounts of project-based development assistance from GEF through which a wide variety of project management skills have been developed. These skills include project management, financial management and logistics management among others. In addition, the recruitment of young female Namibian Project Assistants/Interns at SPAN has helped address the issues of gender and sustainability under this project. Some of the Project Managers that have worked on the project have gone on to join international development organisations and to manage follow-on projects, while the interns who have worked on the project have acquired skills that they will be able to use later on in their professional lives. The Government of Namibia needs to ensure that at the end of each project all relevant staff involved in these initiatives are retained either through integration into national government entities or through engagement in follow on projects to avoid loss of skilled personnel. There is need for the development of a deliberate strategy that ensures that nationals with project management skills are retained in the country. .

6. Complex projects which include capacity building and changing the way governments and local level stakeholders do business require long implementation time frames to allow for the institutionalisation of their outputs. Government processes are generally slow. A good example is that of the process of developing the Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill which has taken the better part of 12 years and all six years of the implementation of the SPAN project..

The SPAN project was originally designed as a two-phase project but ended up being implemented as a single phase project after changes to the GEF planning procedures. The original two phases would have allowed enough time for the realisation of intended project outputs. There is therefore need to ensure that such projects are appropriately designed with adequate implementation timeframes being provided for to facilitate the realisation of desired project results.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Final Evaluations are not meant to make recommendations for follow-on actions. However, where specific issues of importance are identified, specific recommendations can be made to assist with improving the way projects and programmes are designed and managed.

Namibia continues to attract support from GEF and other donors in support of biodiversity management and sustainable land management programmes. It is therefore easy for the country to continue with the implementation of such programmes on the strength of expected continued resource flows and not stop to assess where these programmes are headed.

It is recommended that UNDP step back and conduct a programme/project audit across the biodiversity, water, capacity building and sustainable land management spectrum to distill lessons and experiences from all initiatives for use in the design of new programme interventions.

The evaluator understands that METT is a global management tool developed for use in tracking the effectiveness of PA management initiatives and that Namibia has already amended some aspects of this tool to come up with NAMETT which addresses Namibian conditions specifically. However, the evaluator observed that this tool is mechanistic as it uses numeric measures for assessing project outputs which are not appropriate for measuring aspects such as ecosystem health which are important for assessing the effectiveness of PA management.

It is recommended that UNDP and GEF assess the utility of the METT given the experience with its use in projects to date. This should be done with a view to developing an assessment tool that adequately addresses more than just process indicators of PA management. METT should also assess progress with issues such as ecosystems health which are important for assessing management effectiveness at park level.

8.0 ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference- Final Project Evaluation

MET/UNDP/GEF Implementation of the Strengthening Protected Area Network (SPAN) Project

1. INTRODUCTION

The monitoring and Evaluation Policy (M&E Policy) at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives to:

- a) Monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- b) Provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- c) Promote accountability for resource use; and
- d) Documents, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective Project Monitoring and evaluation (M&E). These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project e.g .Periodic monitoring of indicators through the annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR).Project Steering Committee meeting-or as specified and time-bound exercises such as Mid-Term Reviews (MTR), Audit Reports and Final Evaluations (FE).In accordance with UNDP/GEF policies and mid-term and final evaluations. The evaluation is in response to GEF Council decision on transparency and better access to information. Final evaluations are intended to evaluate the overall impacts of the project. They are conducted by an independent evaluator not associated with the implementation of the project at any stage.

2. BACKGROUND

The Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN) Project is a six-year project which officially started in 2006 with funding from the Global Environmental facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP-Namibia). The project is housed within the (MET). Overall, SPAN was planned to contribute towards the realization of the Namibian Government's strategic vision for Protected Areas (PAs). SPAN has been designed to be implemented in two phases- during Phase 1 (6 years- 2006-2012) interventions include: (i) strengthening systematic capacity-namely the enabling legal/policy environment and financial mechanisms for PA management; (ii) strengthening the institutional capacity for PA management, including partnership with other government agencies, local communities and the private sector, to add to the range of the options currently available. These interventions are critical to improve management effectiveness in the PA system as a whole.

Phase II (5 years) was envisaged to build on the successes of Phase I by consolidating the experience and lessons learned in Phase I ensuring that PAs are systematically Mainstreamed into regional and local

development, building on the lessons learned and experience gained. Funding for Phase II was not secured and therefore the project will end after Phase I.

The Project Development Goal:

The long-term goal of the SPAN Project is insuring the **sustainable management of renewable natural resources protects biodiversity while contributing to equitable economic and social development.**

The Project Objectives:

The immediate objective of the project is **“to increase management effectiveness of the national PA network for biodiversity conservation”**.

The Project has three Outcomes, and associated Outputs as listed below:

Outcome 1: Improved systematic capacity provides the enabling framework for enhancing PA management effectiveness (It is worrying that this was not copied correctly)

- 2.1 Park and Wildlife management Act and Regulations
- 2.2 Park Management and Plans
- 2.3 Sustainable PA Network Plan
- 2.4 Systematic biodiversity Monitoring Mechanism
- 2.5 Knowledge Management System

Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for PA management are strengthened, resulting in more effective use of financial and human resources

- 2.1 Structural Reorganization
- 2.2 Devolution of Decision making and Financial Management
- 2.3 Individual and Park-Level Performance M&E
- 2.4 Training and incentive Mechanisms
- 2.5 PA Economics and business Planning Capacity
- 2.6 Partnership Building Capacity
- 2.7 HIV/AIDS Succession Planning Capacity

Outcome 3: PA management know-how is expanded and reinforced through innovative field management demonstrations

- 3.1 Field Demonstration Site 1: Ai-Ais Hot Springs Game Park
- 3.2 Field Demonstration Site 2: Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili Complex
- 3.3 Field Demonstration Site 3: Etosha/Skeleton Coast link
- 3.4 Field Demonstration Site 4: Sperrgebiet National Park (combined with field demonstration site 1)

3. GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION:

The final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project “SPAN” is initiated by the Namibia Office and it is being undertaken in accordance with the UNDP/GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policy See:

(http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepolicies_procedures.html)

The principal purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the project's implementation results and impacts as required by the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. It is also mandatory to evaluate and review any UNDP project of the magnitude USD 1 million or more, at mid-term and when the assistance is about to be phased out, the final evaluation.

4. PROJECT PERFORMANCE:

4.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION

The final project evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the

1 Tourism is the third biggest industry in the country and shows the most promise for growth amongst the existing production sectors. With the right mechanisms, PA tourism benefits can be spread far deep into the regional and national economy, and improved PA management systems could substantially contribute to poverty reduction, particularly in areas and communities adjacent to the PAs.

Project at its end. The evaluation provides an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, approaches and / or activities to improve the potential of the project to determine whether expected outcomes and project objectives have been achieved within the project time frame. Findings of this evaluation will feed into lessons learnt outcomes of the project as well as provide direction on sustainability of project activities within the ministry of Environment and Tourism.

The purpose of the Final Evaluation is:

- To assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project
- To critically analyse the implementation and management arrangements of the Project and whether this had any effect on the operations of the project and therefore achievements of its results
- To list and document lessons concerning Projects Design, implementation and management
- To assess Project outcomes and implementation constraints
- To assess Projects relevance to national priorities
- To provide guidance for future Projects of similar nature

The evaluators will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives.

Project Performance will be measured based on the quantitative and qualitative indicators defined in the Logical Framework and the Results Framework of the Project Document.

The Report of the Final Evaluation will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions.

The evaluation will in particular assess:

1. Project Design-review the original project intervention strategy including objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities and assess quality of the design and delivery of planned outcomes. The

review should also assess the conceptualization, design, effectiveness, relevance and implement ability of the project . The review should also include the updated logical framework matrix which was designed during Project Inception.

2. Project Progress and impact- assess the achievements of the SPAN Projects against the original objectives, outcomes, outputs, and activities using the indicators as defined in the logical framework contained in the project documents as well as amendments made after the Mid –Term review. Achievements should be measured against indicators as described in the log frame.
3. Project implementation:
 - a. Project management and arrangements, 1.e., effectiveness of, the UNDP Country Office, the Project Management Unit (SPAN PMU), and the demonstration sites;
 - b. Quality and timeliness of delivering of outputs and activities;
 - c. Financial situation (i.e., budget and expenditure status⁰. Financial audits done and access to audit reports (2006,2007,2008,2009,2010,2011);
 - d. Cooperation among partners including but not limited to: GEF- supported projects (ICEMA, NACOMA, CPP-NAM, SGP, NAMPLACE, AAP-NAM , CEGEM), UNDP, Government counterparts (Ministry of Environment and Tourism ; Mines and Energy; Fisheries and Marine Resources, Botanical Research Institute), bilateral-funded projects (USIAD, KFW,EU-RPRP, Conservation international, Millennium Challenge Account, GTZ, SKEP; PMU; demonstration sites (Etosha-Skeleton Coast, // Ai-Ais, Bwabwata-Mudumu-Mamili, Sperrgebiet) and private companies (NAMDEB, NWR, NTB); as well as those listed in the project document in the stakeholder participation plan as project co-financiers;
 - e. Responsiveness of the project management to adapt and implement changes in project execution, based on partner and stakeholder feedback;

Based on the above points , evaluation should provide a document of approximately 50 pages indicating what projects activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts were achieved, and specifically:

4.2 SCOPE OF EVALUATION

While the specific issues of concern are listed in the following paragraphs, a reference to the UNDP programming manual and UNDP/GEF guidelines to conduct final evaluation should be made for addressing the issues not covered below.

The evaluation will include ratings on the following aspects: (1) Sustainability and (2) Outcome/Achievement of objectives (the extent which the projects immediate and development objectives were achieved). The review team should provide ratings for three of the criteria included in the Final Evaluations: (1) Implementation Approach; (2) Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; and (3) Monitoring and Evaluation. The ratings will be based upon the UNDP/GEF six-point scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HS).

4.2a) Project Conceptualization /Design:

1. Whether the problem the project was addressing was clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived?
2. Whether the target beneficiaries and end-users of the results of the project were clearly identified?
3. Whether the objectives and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with observable success indicators?

4. Whether the relationship between objectives, outputs, activities and inputs of the project were logically articulated?
5. Whether the project started with a well-prepared work-plan and reasons, if any, for deviations?
6. Whether the indicators were SMART?

4.2b) Project Relevance:

1. Whether the project is relevant to the development priorities of the country?
2. Given the objectives of the project whether appropriate institutions have been assisted?

4.2c) Project implementation:

The evaluation team will examine the quality and timeliness in regard to:

1. The delivery of inputs specified in the project document, including selection of sub-project, institutional arrangements, interest of beneficiaries, the scheduling and actual implementation.
2. The fulfilment of the success criteria as outline in the project document.
3. The responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (both facilitating and impeding project implementation).
4. Lessons from other relevant projects if incorporated in the project implementation.
5. The monitoring and backstopping of the project as expected by the Government and UNDP.
6. The delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of personnel premises and indigenous equipment.
7. The project's collaboration with industry associations, private sector and civil society.

4.2d) Project Performance:

1. Whether the management arrangements of the project were appropriate?
2. Whether the project resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality.
3. Whether the project resources were used effectively to produce planned results?
4. Whether the project was cost-effective compared to similar interventions?
5. Whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable?
6. The role of UNDP Country Office and its impact (positive or negative) on the functioning of the project.

4.2e) Results/Success of the projects applied to each of the Specific Outcomes and Outputs:

The overall outputs are defined in the project document that should form the main basis for this evaluation. In addition to the final targets in the logical framework, the details of the specific impacts to be investigated are.

1. What are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its objectives, outcomes and outputs?
2. What other potential areas could have provided project success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.
3. What major issues and problems affected the implementation of the project, and what factors could have resolved them?
4. Given an opportunity, what actions would the evaluation team members recommend to realize actual success?

5. Level of institutional networking achieved and capacity development of key partners, if done in a structured manner at different stages- from inception to relevant.
6. Environmental impacts (positive and negative) and remedial actions taken, if relevant.
7. Social impacts, including impact on the lives of women at each demonstration site.
8. Any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced the outcome of the project.

4.3 METHODOLOGY/EVALUATION APPROACH:

The team should provide details in respect of:

1. Documentation review (desk study);
2. Interviews and/or consultations;
3. Field visit if any
4. Questionnaires , if used; and
5. Participation of stakeholders and /or partners.

5. TIME TABLE:

The duration of the evaluation will be a total 40 working days and will commence towards late October 2011 with the following tentative schedule for the critical milestones:

- Acceptance and commencement s of duties by end October 2011
- Inception meeting with the principal parties (UNDP, MET and SPAN PMU) by first week of November 2011 , with a schedule and definite timetable for the overall evaluation including field trips.
- Presentation of the draft to key stakeholders and incorporation of comments if deemed necessary, including submission of five copies of the final evaluation report by end of January 2012
- Draft evaluation report by February 2012
- Final comments on the draft evaluation report by mid-February 2012
- Final evaluation report by 28 February 2012, in five (hard and electronic) copies.

6. CONSULTATIONS:

The consultant and team members are open to consult all reports, files, manuals, guidelines and resources people they feel essential, to make the most effective findings, conclusions and recommendations. The mission will maintain close liaison with the UNDP Resident Representative and Deputy Resident Representative in Namibia, as well as other concerned official and agencies in UNDP; the SPAM PMU and National Project Director

7. REPORTING

The evaluation team will report directly to the Senior Management of UNDP Namibia, UNDP/GEF RCU, but mostly to the UNDP Resident Representative and /or his designated officials to act on his behalf. The consultant shall work in close collaboration with the SPAN PMU. The consultant will prepare and submit the draft report of the evaluation to UNDP. A presentation and debriefing of the reports to UNDP, the project beneficiaries (Executing – MET and implementing –DPWM/DSS agencies) , PMG and PAC will be made in November as part of the combined wrap-up workshop for the SPAN project . The reporting schedule will be finalized during the inception between the evaluation team and key stakeholders.

DISCLOSURE

Although the team is free to discuss with the authorities on anything relevant to the assignment, under the terms of reference, the team is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP or the Government of Namibia.

Annex 1: Final Evaluation Report: Sample outline

Executive Summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project and its development context

- Projects start and its duration
- Problems that the projects seeks to address
- Main stakeholder
- Outcomes/Results expect

Findings and Conclusion

- Project formulation
- Implementation approach
- Country Ownership/Driveness
- Stakeholders participation
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions
- Management arrangements

Implementation

- Financial Planning
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Executions and implementation modalities
- Management by UNDP country office in Namibia
- Coordination and operational issues.
- Financial management and flow of resources.
- Co-financing (tracking and verification).

Results

- Attainment of objectiveness, outcomes and outputs
- Sustainability beyond the Project life Cycle
- Contribution to capacity building /development, sub -regional and national development

Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the next phase of the project.
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project and relevance , for inclusion in future initiatives
- Proposal for future directions underlying main objectives.

Lessons Learned

- Best and worst practice in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success of the project.

Annex2

- TOR for the SPAN Final Evaluation
- SPAN Final Evaluation Schedule
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used, if any, and
- Summary of results.

NB Whereas the above is fine for the advertisement, I would prefer that you attach the Sample Report Outline provided below as an integral part of the contract with the selected consultant. This should form part of what is signed with the consultant.

TERMINAL EVALUATION SAMPLE REPORT OUTLINE

Table of contents :(with accurate page number references)

Acronyms

1. Executives summary (including an overall rating of the projects (using the 6 point GEF/UNDP rating scale.

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, rating of progress towards objectives as well as rating of progress on implementation , recommendations and lessons learned;

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed;
- Methodology of the evaluation (*see example provided below in Appendix 1 to this document for Specific guidance);
- Structure of the evaluation.
- Ethics. (See sample statement in Appendix 2 to this document below).

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration ;
- Problems that the project seek to address;
- Immediate and development objectives of the project;
- Main stakeholders;
- Results expected.

4. Findings and conclusions

In addition to descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** in conformity with GEF/UNDP guidelines for final evaluations using the following division: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Highly Unsatisfactory. (The guidelines for the use of the scales will be provided to the successful candidate).

4.1 *Project Formulation*

- *Conceptualization /Design(R)*. This should assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective where appropriate, visible and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated in project design.
- *Country –ownership/Driveness*. Assess to the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within nationals, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
- *Stakeholder participation(R)* Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
- *Replication approach*. Determine the ways in which lessons and experience are coming out of the project were/are to be replicated of scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

- *Linkages* between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage. This element should also address the question of to what extent the project address UNDP priorities; gender, south-south cooperation, poverty- environment linkages (sustainable livelihoods) and disaster prevention and recovery. The linkages between the project and the UNDAF for the particular country/countries and the

4.2. *Project Implementation*

- (i) *Implementation Approach (R)*. This should include assessments of the following aspects:
 - (ii) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M&E activities if required.
 - (iii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; Change in management arrangement to enhance implementation.
 - (iv) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other projects activities.
 - (v) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
 - (vi) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
- *Monitoring and evaluation(R)*. Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether actions has been taken on the results on this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
- *Stakeholder participation (R)*. This should include assessments of the mechanism for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:
 - (i) The production and dissemination of information and lessons generated by the project.
 - (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.

- (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
 - (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.
- *Financial Planning*: Including an assessment of:
 - (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
 - (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
 - (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
 - (iv) Co-financing (has this been realized?)
 - *Procurement Management*
 - (i) Technical and human resource capacity for procurement management
 - (ii) Linkage between work programming, procurement planning, budgeting, and disbursement planning
 - (iii) Effectiveness of procurement management, as indicated by results of audits (internal and/or external), and reports of review and supervision missions by IAs.
 - *Sustainability*. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: Development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities

4.3 Results

- *Attainment of Outcomes/Achievement of objectives (R)*: Including a description and rating of the extent to which the project 's objectives (environmental developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions) the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- *Sustainability*: Including and appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/ external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
- *Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff*
- *Summary Table of ratings*.

5. Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. Recommendations should be specific and clearly justified in relation to the achievement of the project objectives.
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposal for future directions underlining main objectives
- Changes to project strategy, including the log frame indicators and targets

6. Lessons learned

- This should highlight the 'best' and 'worst' practices in addressing issues relating to relevance performance and success.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits, , issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- Lists of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with a evaluation findings and conclusions).

Appendix 1

EXAMPLE OF METHODOLOGY OUTLINE:

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the MTE will include, but may not be limited to the following:

A) Documentation review including, inter alia:

- Project Documentation and Project Appraisal Document;
- Project implementation reports (PIR's);
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
- Audit reports
- Annual Review Reports
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
- Financial and Administration Guidelines

The following documents will also be available:

- The project M&E framework
- Knowledge products from service providers
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
- Minutes of the Project Board Meetings, task teams and other project management meetings
- Maps
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

B) Interview with:

- UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
- Staff of the Project Coordination Unit;
- Executing agencies;
- Members of the Project Board
- Task Team members (if appropriate).
- Project stakeholders, particularly members of the various project level steering committees and project beneficiaries;
- Participating members of the Pilot projects
- Relevant staff in participating government departments.

C) Field Visits:

The following projects sites should be visited:

In addition, but **separate from project staff and their institutions**, the evaluators will need to specifically meet with selected communities (intended beneficiaries of the project during the field visits).

Appendix 2

Sample Ethics Statement:

This Evaluation is guided by, and has applied, the following principles:

Independence The Evaluator is independent and has not been engaged in the Project activities, nor was he responsible in the past to the design, implementation or supervision of the project.

Impartiality The Evaluator endeavoured to provide a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the project. The evaluation process has been impartial in all stages and taken into account all the views received from stakeholders.

Transparency The Evaluator conveyed in as open a manner as possible the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of the findings. This evaluation report aims to provide transparent information on its sources, methodologies and approach.

Disclosure This report serves as mechanisms through which the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation are disseminated to policymakers, operational staff, beneficiaries, the general public and other stakeholders.

Ethical The Evaluator has respected the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and the sources of specific information and opinions in this report are not disclosed except where necessary and then only after confirmation with the consultee.

Competencies and Capacities The credentials of the Evaluator in terms of his expertise, seniority and experience as required by the terms of reference are provided in an annex; and the methodology for assessment of results and performance is described.

Credibility This Evaluation has been based on data and observations which are considered reliable and dependable with reference to the quality of instruments and procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret information.

Utility The Evaluator strived to be as well-informed as possible and this ensuing report is considered as relevant, timely and as concise as possible. In an attempt to be of maximum benefit to stakeholders, the report presents in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings and issues, conclusions and recommendations.

ANNEX 2: SPAN Final Evaluation Schedule and List of Persons Interviewed

SPAN EoP Evaluation Schedule January 2012

Date	Area	Travel and Accommodation Details	Stakeholders	Contact
December 2011	Botswana	N/A	Mr Herman Iipumbu	Mr Herman Iipumbu hermanfrans@gmail.com Tel: +264 61 204 61111
15 January 2012	Consultant Arrives Windhoek	Transport to be organized by PMU	Mr Samson Mulonga SPAN Project Coordinator Nick de Voss SPAN Project Administrator	Mr Samson Mulonga samson@span.org.na Nick de Voss nick@span.org.na Tel: +264-612405
16 January 2012 Monday	Windhoek	Meeting with SPAN PMU (09h00)	Mr Samson Mulonga and other PMU staff	Mr Samson Mulonga samson@span.org.na Tel: +264-612842505
		Meeting with Ms Luisa Mupetami (14h30)	Ms Mupetami, Director of Scientific Services	Ms Mupetami lmupetami@met.na Tel: +264-61284 2530
17 January 2012	Windhoek	Meeting with UNDP CO Namibia (11h00)	Mr Neil Boyer, UNDP RR Ms Martha Mwangi, ARR and Head (Energy & Environment)	Mr Neil Boyer neil.boyer@undp.org Ms Martha Mwangi martha.mwangi@undp.org Tel: +264 61 204 6231
		Meeting with Mr Teo Nghitila (14h30)	Mr Teo Nghitila, Director of Environmental Affairs	Mr Teo Nghitila nghitila@met.na Tel: +264-612842700
18 January 2012	Windhoek	Meeting with the former SPAN Coordinator (08h30)	Mr Michael Sibalatani, NAMPLACE Coordinator (SPAN Former Coordinator)	Mr Michael Sibalatani msibalatani@namplace.org.na Tel: +264 61 284 2728
		Meeting with BMM Project (10h30)	Mr Ed Humphrey, Project Manager	Mr Ed Humphrey e_aino@iway.na

				Tel: +264-61300194
		Meetings with MET PS (11h30)	Dr. Kalumbi Shangula, MET: Permanent Secretary	Dr Shangula kshangula@met.na Tel: +264-612842185
		Meeting with NNF/SKEP (14h30)	Mr Jullien Fennessy, NNF Director Mr Jonas Nghishidi, SKEP Coordinator	Mr Jullien Fennessy jf@nnf.org.na Mr Jonas Nghishidi jn@nnf.org.na Tel: +264-61248345
19 January 2012	Windhoek	Meeting with Mr Manie le Roux (09h00)	Mr Manie le Roux, CCW, Central Region	Mr Manie le Roux met.nnp@iway.na Tel: +264-64-2842523
		Meeting with Mr Karl Aribeb, (11h00)	Mr Karl Aribeb, International Coordinator for Peace Parks Foundation	Mr Karl Aribeb aribeb.kamaku@gmail.com Tel: +264-61 254332
		Meeting with IRDNC, (14h30)	Ms Karin Nuulimba, IRDNC Director	Ms Karin Nuulimba Tel: +264-61228506
20 January 2012	Windhoek	Meeting with BCC	Nico E. Willemse, Senior Project Manager	Mr Nico Willemse NicoW@unops.org Tel: +264 61 246 948
		Meeting with Mr Ulrich Boois and Mr Colgar Sikopo	Mr Ulrich Boois, Acting Director: Parks and Wildlife Management	Mr Ulrich Boois uboois@met.na Tel: +264-612521
23-24 January 2012	Rundu and North East	Fly to Rundu in the morning Meeting with Former Project Field Coordinator, MET field staff and stakeholders in the NE Demo Sites	Mr Simon Mayes, BMM Parks Coordinator (Former SPAN Field Coordinator) Mr Beaven Munali-Deputy Director IDRNC Uriukwao Matundu-Coordinator-NAMPLACE Manuanzi Cebens-Manager Waiparo Conservancy Benefactor Saloishando-	Mr Simon Mayes, Cell: +264-811481236

			<p>Ranger Mudumu National Park</p> <p>Ms. Monica Shikongo-Warden Bwabwata East</p> <p>Mr Phillip Stein, CCW, NE Parks</p> <p>Mr. Kamiyo Jack Mr. Joel Mahingi Mr. Petros Quaba Mr. Thomas George Mr. Bkack Mahingi Mr. Alfred Chadau Mr. Andrew Ndala Mr. Johannes Litjolo Mr. Benson Kupinga</p>	<p>Mr Phillip Steyn psteyn@met.na</p> <p>Karamasan Association members</p>
26 – 27 January 2012	Rosh Pinah	Fly to Rosh Pinah in the morning Meeting with Project Field Coordinator, MET field staff and stakeholders in the two South Demo Sites	<p>Mr Samson Mulonga Mr Harry Tjihukununa (CCW) Mr Francis Santambwa (CW) Mr Trygve Cooper (CW) Wayne Handley (Senior Ranger) Ms Ronel van de Merwe (Manager, Environment, NAMDEB) Max Witbooi Mendes Vinte Otto von Kaschke Emmerelda B. Rooi J.P. Markus Paulus Johaness Mr Chris Morirong (Scopion Mine)</p>	<p>Mr Samson Mulonga SPAN Project Coordinator samson@span.org.na Tel: +264-612842505</p>
30 January 2012	Windhoek		Dr Schnieder	
			Chris Weaver-General Manager WWF Country Office Namibia	

Note: FC – Field Coordinator, CCW – Chief Control Warden, CW – Chief Warden, W – Warden

ANNEX 3: List of documents reviewed

Project Document and Reports

SPAN Project Document
SPAN Project Brochures
PIR – 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009,2010
Standard Progress Report 2007 and 2008
Quarterly reports – 2007-2010
Project Management Group meeting minutes 2006-2011
Project Advisory Committee meeting proceedings – 2011

Project Management Related Documents

Gender and Health Mainstreaming Plan
NAMETT report
Mid-term report on the needs weighted average indicator
Project Management Framework
Annual Workplans 2008 and 2009
Hman Wildlife Conflict Management Workshop Report (2006)
Human Resource Transformation Project Inception Workshop (2009)
Economic Valuation of PA system
Valuing Namibia's Parks booklet
National Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict Management
National Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land
MET's Strategic Plan 2007/08-2011/12
Incident Book Data Base guide
Park Branding ToR
HEWG proposal
Report on the Financial Administration System Transformation (FAST) Project – Phase 1
Sandpaper-Variou Editions
Updated Policy on Prospecting and Mining in PAs
Report on MET Restructuring (2010)
BMM Parks Management Plan
BMM Parks Tourism Development Plan
BMM Parks Zoning and Management Posters
Mudumu North Complex Management Plan and Posters
Sperrgebiet National Park Management Plan
Sperrgebiet National Park Tourism Option Plan
Sperrgebiet National Park posters and banners
Sperrgebiet National Park Advisory Committee meeting proceedings
/Ai-/Ais Park Management Plan
New Fish River Canyon Viewpoint design
The National Policy on Coastal Management in Namibia
Assessment of People's Engagement in Sustainable Use Activities on the Coastal Zone of Namibia (2-011)
Draft Protected Area and Wildlife Management Bill
Policy on Park Residents and Neighbours
Draft MET HIV and AIDS Policy

Update of the economic valuation and park financing plan
Collaborative Management Discussion Paper
Collaborative Management Manual